



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The
Eucharistic Feast.



THE
ECCLESIASTICAL
BOOKS
OF THE
CATHOLIC
CHURCH
OF THE
UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA
PUBLISHED BY
THE
CATHOLIC BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK



600097143U



“The Eucharistic Feast.”

A BRIEF HISTORICAL INQUIRY
INTO THE
TRUE NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY THE
REV. L. P. MERCIER, M.A.,
OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;
CHAPLAIN AND AFTERNOON PREACHER OF THE
FOUNDLING HOSPITAL.



LONDON:
WILLIAM MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1868.

138. f. 76.



PREFACE.

THE following treatise being intended mainly for popular use, and for general readers, I have in every instance, as far as possible, avoided the adoption of technical language and theological terminology. For the same reason the extracts from classical Greek and Latin authors are made in the translations which seem the best and the most easily accessible. In quoting from the old doctors of the Church, I have also, as far as may be, used those editions which can be obtained with least trouble and expense; and where I have been obliged to have recourse to black-letter print, I have transferred it to the spelling of the present day.

What therefore may be lost in the appearance of a severe theological disquisition will, it is

hoped, be thus more than compensated by clearness and simplicity, and by the facility which is given to the reader to verify the grounds of the argument in all cases, as he proceeds.

LONDON,

September, 1867.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.	
	PAGE
Difficulties respecting the right Understanding of the Lord's Supper	1
CHAPTER I.	
Jewish Origin of the Christian Religion	6
CHAPTER II.	
Origin and Nature of the Jewish Religion . . .	14
CHAPTER III.	
Nature and Import of the Jewish Sacrifices . .	22
CHAPTER IV.	
Peace-Offerings under the Mosaic Covenant . .	28
CHAPTER V.	
Ancient mode of Covenant with Sacrifice . . .	33

	PAGE
CHAPTER VI.	
The Jewish Passover a Sacrificial Meal . . .	43
CHAPTER VII.	
Figurative Meaning in the Lord's Supper . . .	50
CHAPTER VIII.	
The Lord's Supper a Solemn Covenant with God	59
CHAPTER IX.	
Doctrines of the Divines of the Sixteenth Century	82
CONCLUSION.	
Spiritual Nature of the Lord's Supper . . .	122

ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Importance of the Subject—Danger of mistaking
Sentiment for Belief—Ambiguous use of the term
Mystery—Its different Significations—Popular use of
the term—Spirit in which the enquiry is proposed to be
conducted pp. 1—5

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.—Christianity sprang out of Judaism—
The Levitical Ritual unattractive to the popular mind
—Our Blessed Lord, humanly speaking, a Jew—The
Gospel the fulfilment of the Law.

SECTION II.—Adaptation of the Law to the necessity
of the Case—Sensuous notions of the Israelites—Unity
of the Godhead a Fundamental Doctrine of the Egyp-
tians—Transference of acknowledged Symbolisms—
Heathen belief in the Personal residence of the Deity—

Condescension of Jehovah to a Covenant with His People	pp. 6—13
--	----------

CHAPTER II.

Jehovah a Sovereign—The Royal Tent or Tabernacle—Its Furniture—The Holy of Holies the Chamber of the Divine Sovereign—Sacrifices of three kinds, (a) Burnt Offerings, (b) Sin Offerings, (c) Peace Offerings—Universal ancient Idea of Sacrifices as Propitiations for Guilt—Three modifications of the Sacrifices—Description of the same—Fruits of the Earth offered together with the Bleeding Sacrifices	pp. 14—21
--	-----------

CHAPTER III.

Jehovah a Covenant Sovereign—Nature of the Burnt Offerings—Necessity of Blood-shedding—Its true nature in connection with the idea of an Atonement—Necessity of a Vicarious Oblation—Transference of Sin to an innocent Animal—Why the <i>whole</i> Burnt Sacrifice was consumed—Mode of Sin-offering—The Priestly Meal introduced in the Sin-offering as a New Element	pp. 22—27
---	-----------

CHAPTER IV.

Of the Peace-offerings—The Sacrificial Meal now the chief Feature—Characteristics of the three kinds of	
---	--

Offerings—The Sacrifice an offering to God, who thus symbolically eats and drinks with His People—Corrections against Carnal and Sensual Notions—Israel a Priestly Nation—Still the Aaronic family alone consecrated to offer Sacrifices—Why no Meal was permitted with the Burnt Sacrifice . . . pp. 28—32

CHAPTER V.

Importance and meaning of the Symbolism in the Sacrificial Meal—It is the medium and mode of Covenant common to most Heathen and Eastern Nations—Fully developed only in the case of the Peace-offerings—True nature and mode of a Covenant explained and supported by instances and extracts from the Old Testament—Sanctity attributed to joint participation—The solemn ratification of the Mosaic Covenant—Parallel instances from profane Authors, Greek and Roman—Relation of the Passover to Sacrifices, especially the Peace-offerings—The Paschal Supper the highest Sacrificial Meal . . . pp. 33—42

CHAPTER VI.

First institution of the Passover—Localisation of the Paschal Sacrifice after the settlement of the Israelites—"Christ our Passover"—Mode of celebration of the Paschal Sacrifice and Meal—Examination of the Evange-

X

lical narrative of our Lord's last Passover—"The Altar" and "The Table of the Lord" amongst the Jews—The Lord's Supper the successor of the Paschal Meal—In what way pp. 43—49

CHAPTER VII.

Our Lord's words in the Institution of the Supper considered—Their Figurative Meaning—Proved by Quotations and Parallelisms from general Scripture—The Disciples understood our Lord to speak Figuratively and Metaphorically of His Body and Blood—Proofs that they did so, (a) from His custom of explaining His meaning when misunderstood, (b) from the language of the Apostles themselves—Examination of St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. xi.—Argument drawn from his rebuke to the Corinthian Converts for improper reception of the Eucharist pp. 50—58

CHAPTER VIII.

On the offerings to Demons alluded to by St. Paul (1 Cor. x.)—Importance of the Fact as bearing upon the present Question—Heathen Rites at Sacrifices—Drinking of the Blood of the Victim—The Lord's Supper a mode of Covenant—Meaning of the word Testament—Sacrifice of Christ upon the Altar of the Cross—Doctrine of Transubstantiation, even if true, of no avail—Cudworth's View quoted—Sum of the Argument

—Christ the True Paschal Lamb—Transubstantiation irreconcilable with the facts of the case—"The True Bread"—Meaning of the word "True"—Man's spiritual life dependent upon the *fact*, not upon the substance, of the Sacrifice—Christ's conversation with the Jews in St. John vi.—Our Lord explains His words—St. Paul's language (1 Cor. xi.) further considered—Meaning of *Damnation* as applied to the unworthy reception by the Corinthians—The case of Judas—Purpose and Object of the Sacrifice of Christ—Case supposed of deliberate mockery by unworthy participation pp. 59—81

CHAPTER IX.

Appeal to the Doctrines of the Divines of the Reformation and subsequent period—Bishop Jewel—Words of Jesus respecting His own Departure—Purpose of the *visible* Ascension of Jesus—4th and 28th Articles of the Church—Church Doctrine of the Spiritual Presence—Extracts from (1) Tudor Martyrs, (2) Later Tudor Divines, (3) Tudor Stuart Divines, (4) Later Stuart Divines—(Latimer to Cosin)—The Eucharistic Sacrifice considered—In what sense a Sacrifice—Opinions of the great Doctors, Cranmer, Beveridge—Joseph Mede's Definition—Mode of Presence not revealed—Attempts therefore at definition and dogmatism to be avoided—Examination of the terms "True,"

"Real," "Substance"—Archbishop Grindal's remark concerning Dr. Philpot—Cause of the Differences of Opinion prevailing upon the Subject . pp. 82—121

CONCLUSION.

Significance of the Lord's Supper regarded as a Eucharistic Feast, or a Feast upon a Sacrifice—Three successive stages in the Divine Revelation—Gradual Development necessitated by, and adapted to, Man's Intellectual Progress—"The Three Temples of the One God"—The present, the Administration of the Spirit—Conclusion pp. 122—127

“THE EUCHARISTIC FEAST.”

“Christ our Passover is [was—has been] sacrificed for us : therefore let us keep the feast.”—1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

INTRODUCTION.

DIFFICULTIES RESPECTING THE RIGHT UNDER- STANDING OF THE LORD’S SUPPER.

At a time when men’s minds are much disquieted respecting certain topics of religious belief, it is hoped that the following pages, setting forth generally the scriptural nature of one of the most debated, and yet vital points of Christian doctrine, may be not inopportune or without advantage to some.

Nothing is more painful to a thoroughly conscientious mind than a state of uncertainty regarding any article of belief. To “halt between two opinions” is not only unsatisfactory in itself, but dangerous to a healthy condition of thought. For the tendency of the human mind seems naturally to lean towards *positivism* ; and hence it happens that many persons, unable to

satisfy themselves upon the subject, seek to make a kind of compromise with their consciences, and to shift the burden of responsibility from their own shoulders upon those of others who will undertake authoritatively to decide for them what they are to believe.

There are also many, who are apt, especially in religious matters, to mistake sentiment for belief, and to follow the bias of their own feelings, instead of endeavouring patiently to arrive at a conclusion founded upon sufficient and satisfactory evidence.

Perhaps one chief difficulty lying at the bottom of the question of the Holy Eucharist consists in the ambiguous meaning of the term *mystery*.¹ For there are no less than four ways in which this term is variously employed in our language. It may be worth while to notice them.

1. In Greek classical authors this term means "a secret doctrine," that is, one kept from the vulgar, and taught only to those who were initiated in the rites of certain deities, which rites came themselves eventually to be termed "mysteries."² These were probably a kind of dramatic or allegorical representations of certain

¹ Abp. Whately's "Charge on the Right Principle of the Interpretation of Scripture," pp. 28, 29.

² Liddell and Scott, *Gk. Lex.* s. v.

popular myths; whence, also, the religious plays or "mysteries" of the middle ages derived their appropriate name.

2. We meet with the term in the writings of the New Testament, where it means a doctrine hidden from the world, but made known to Christians;¹ or the revelation of some truth, fact, or doctrine,² which could not have been known but by Divine communication. Sometimes, also, it is employed to denote a religious system, or an emblem, or allegorical representation.³

And so, our Reformers, adopting probably this latter signification, have applied the term to the Sacraments of the Gospel.⁴

3. In the early Christian writers the word "mystery"⁵ is used synonymously with *sacrament*, or a solemn oath and covenant, and is so

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 7.

² 1 Cor. xv. 51; Eph. vi. 19.

³ 1 Tim. iii. 9; Ephes. v. 32; Rev. i. 20.

⁴ See the office of the Holy Communion, (The Exhortation,) where "*mysteries*" plainly means the outward emblems.

⁵ *Sacramentum* is the Latin term signifying the solemn oath which the Roman soldier took never to desert his standard. See also Art. xxix. of the Church of England.

"The Greek word is *μυστήριον*, so used by St. Paul, "Ephes. v. 32, calling the conjunction of Christ with His

applied because the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered only to those who had been initiated into the Christian Church by Baptism, just as the Passover could be partaken of only by those who had received the rite of circumcision.

4. There is the *popular* use of the term, when we speak of anything being very *mysterious*, i.e. unintelligible, or inexplicable by ordinary processes of reasoning, or known principles of interpretation or explanation. Hence the word becomes linked with such other terms as "fearful," "dreadful," "awful," and so containing some element of "superstitious dread and aversion."¹

When, therefore, a certain awful character is asserted for the Holy Eucharist, involving a claim of supernatural power both for the symbol

"spouse, the Church, *μύστα μυστήριον* ; 'a great mystery.' "The Latin word 'Sacramentum' is of military extraction, it being properly *στρατιωτικὸς ὅρκος*, 'the soldiers' "oath,' by which, upon their first enrolment, they engaged themselves—'stoutly to act whatsoever their "general should command,' as Vegetius hath it, and "from thence it came at length to an indefinite notion, "signifying whatsoever was transacted by the interposition of an oath, which, because it hath something of "religion more than ordinary, might well declare the "appellation of a Sacrament."—*L'Estrange, Alliance of Divine Offices*, ch. viii., p. 355. (Parker, 1846.)

¹ Whately, "Charge," etc., p. 29.

and him who ministers it, people are but too readily disposed to recur to the word "mystery," and to assign to it that meaning which, in popular language, they are accustomed to hear connected with it. To some, indeed, it is not altogether unpleasing to associate this popular usage of the term with a subject unquestionably of so solemn and so spiritual a character as that of the Lord's Supper. But it is both improper and unwise to attribute, even in an exaggerated feeling of reverence, qualities or powers to any ordinance of God, for which we have not His own direct sanction and warrant. We have no right to be wise "above that which is written" on the one hand; nor, on the other, are we justified in leaving unexplained or uncertain to our understandings anything of which He has expressly declared the true nature, for the benefit both of our hearts and minds.

In this spirit, then, I propose to treat the subject of the Lord's Supper in the following pages, not as a topic of mere controversial interest, but as one fraught with deep spiritual import to every one of us, who is bound in humility and reverence to learn no more, and to be content with no less, than what God has Himself revealed for our instruction.

CHAPTER I.

JEWISH ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

SECTION I.

ANY inquiry into the nature and character of the Christian religion, which should put out of sight its essentially Jewish origin, would fail to set it forth in its true light, or to exhibit it in its just and proper proportions in connection with the entire scheme of Divine revelation.

To judge from the modes of speech prevalent amongst us, it would seem as if few persons paid much real attention to the nature and provisions of the Mosaic law; and that fewer still care to realise the fact that Christianity itself, *as a system*, sprang out of Judaism.¹ It may well be that the technical details of the Levitical code do not present much that is attractive to the modern mind; and that, the law of Moses being

¹ See "Bernard's Translation of Vitringa."

now abrogated, Christian readers are disposed to look upon the ritual of the Old Testament as possessing little more than an antiquarian interest for themselves.

Yet this was the system, and with it were bound up the mental associations, in which the Founder of our own religion as well as His immediate followers was educated; and from which, during their own lives, or until the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, they never suffered their national feelings and habits to be dissociated. Up to that period, Christianity and Judaism walked "pari passu" side by side, the shadow gradually contracting and shrinking up, as the sun rose to the meridian, when it became merged and lost in the substance of the perfect Image.

Now our blessed Lord was Himself, in His human nature, *a Jew*; His followers were *Jews*; they preached originally to *Jews*; and hence the New ritual they introduced was naturally founded upon the usages of the Old; no further changes or modifications being made than were necessary to adapt it to a new and higher state of things. And that *new* state was not more an *abrogation* than it was a *fulfilment* of the *old*; for it bore to it the relation of the fruit to the

blossom: and to say that the Old must needs decay when the New has come,¹ is simply to admit that the blossom and the fruit, though springing from the same tree, and directed towards the same end, are yet in themselves not one and the same thing, but rather successive developments of one and the same principle or power of reproduction. Moreover, the Jewish religion was itself in great measure an accommodation to prevailing modes of thought and the existing capability of the human mind.² It is, therefore, in this precursory system that we must naturally look for those rudiments of the Christian religion itself, which became developed only as the progress of the moral and intellectual natures of man reached that point at which purely spiritual truths became capable of germinating into life and power.

As, then, the experienced botanist examines the blossom of a tree, in order to judge of the nature of the coming fruit; so must we, in order to a just appreciation of either, look to Judaism as the early type and embryo of Christianity. In other words, we must search the particulars of the Mosaic law, scanning them from the

¹ Heb. viii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 17.

² See Sect. ii.

height whereon we now stand, and by the light we now possess, if we would duly and rightly estimate the characteristics of the Christian religion.

SECTION II.

Now it is necessary to be borne in mind that the Mosaic dispensation had to be framed for, and accommodated to, the minds of a very peculiar race of men. And it is no derogation from the honour or the omnipotence of God to say that such was the necessity of the case. For the Almighty, ever since the fall of man, recognises and deals with men *as they are*, influences them by appeals to their reason, and compels no man to believe in Him, or requires him to understand more of His revelation, than upon such evidence or to such an extent as his mind has been by Him constituted to recognise and accept. Upon even a cursory examination of the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, it is impossible not to perceive the mode in which God deals with His creatures, how He reasons with them, expostulates with them,

almost at times seems to excuse Himself to them,—in fact places Himself, as it were, upon the platform of their own mental habits and capacities.¹

Such then were the principles, and such the mode of treatment, upon which the Almighty, through Moses and the prophets, condescended to deal with the Israel of the time. He took into consideration (as we should say) all that was in fallen man, the nature of his views founded upon the impressions which had been made upon uneducated minds depressed and debased by long years of servitude amongst an idolatrous and mystic people, the materialist notions to which they had become wedded, the exceeding narrowness of their prejudices, and their tendency to assimilation to the views and practices of nations more intellectually advanced than themselves.

It is indeed only by attentively considering the circumstances of the people, the modes of thought and intellectual tendencies of the age, as well as the nature of the models which they had so long had displayed before their eyes, that

¹ See particularly Psalm l. 7—23; Isaiah i. 11—20; v. 1—4; xli. 21—23; xliii. 26; Jeremiah i. 9—12; xii. 1; Ezekiel xviii. 1—32; Micah vi. 1—8.

we can estimate the true nature of that ceremonial religion which God, in His merciful providence, framed for the acceptance and protection of the Israelites. A purely spiritual religion they could not have received; there was no chord or pivot in their mental structure to which it could have appealed, or upon which it could have fastened its hold. Their ideas had become fashioned and moulded among objects of sense; and through their senses and outward perceptions their minds must be reached, their consciences touched, and their conduct influenced. Hence it is apparent how suitable for them was a system of religion which, having for its basis the conventionalism of known and recognised form, was yet eminently adapted to become the shrine of the deepest and most spiritual truths. It was not necessary that every outward form or ceremony, nor that every conception of even a Pagan system should be at once and violently eradicated. Even under the multifold symbols and emblems of Egypt, the doctrines of the Unity of the Invisible God was maintained and taught.¹ There may be out-

¹ Wilkinson, "Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians," vol. iv., pp. 172, 176—180.

ward signs which have their germs in the habits, or even in the nature, of men : and in so far as these are common to men and not merely localised, or identified with specific modes of thought or articles of belief, they may be incorporated as consistently with a true as with a false or a perverted faith.

Upon these principles, then, (arguing from the human point of view) the Mosaic religion and the Levitical manual appear to have been designed and constructed. Without unnecessary violence to intellectual tendencies, or idiosyncrasy of moral perception, established symbolisms were translated from a false system of interpretation to become the expression of inward truths, the simple touch of Divine power transmuting the common and unclean into a vehicle of purity and truth. Such upon the whole, seems to be the nature of all just revolutions based upon moral perceptions and intellectual capabilities. There is no need for further change than to take that which in itself is neither unwholesome, nor yet wholly unmeaning or unsusceptible of a truth, and to place it upon its true basis, gift it with a new power, and fit it at once to the awakened capacities of the mind, or the altered

condition of the relations into which it has to enter.¹

Now intimately connected with the views of the day was the belief in the *personal residence* of the Deity, as the tutelar monarch of the people amongst whom He had His worship.² Hence, when Jehovah would constitute His people into a holy nation, a peculiar people, governed by Himself as their Sovereign and their God, He accommodated His procedure, (if I may reverently use the expression) to the existing mode of thought. He condescended to dwell amongst them, and to bear local habitation, in which His presence should be visibly manifested, and where His own immediate family should minister to His commands. And He also deigned, in recognition of their mental weakness, and the necessity of an external bond of union between His people and Himself, to enter into covenant with them upon those principles and terms with which alone they were acquainted at the time, or could be brought gently, and without a special miracle, to comprehend.

¹ See on this point an excellent note in Kitto's Pictorial Bible, on Exodus xxv. 2; vol. 1, p. 241.

² See "Wilkinson's Manners and Customs," etc. Vol. iv. pp. 199, 200. "Kurtz's History of the Old Covenant," vol. ii., p. 292.

CHAPTER II.

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE JEWISH RELIGION.

I now proceed to develop the idea set forth in the last chapter. From it flows the whole relation of man's condition as a redeemed being, justified and sanctified; first, *imperfectly*, by means of symbols; afterwards, *perfectly*, by the thing symbolised itself.

In order, then, to give a visible proof¹ of His dwelling amongst His people, (that is, of His direct, personal, and immediate sovereignty,) the Almighty caused a tabernacle to be erected to Him during the wandering in the wilderness. This tabernacle was, in fact, *the royal tent*; a moveable edifice of considerable dimensions, constructed of costly materials, such as precious woods, carved and gilded; rich furs, and fine linen, and the like. The interior was divided

¹ See particularly "Kitto's Pictorial Bible," notes on Exodus xxv. 2, 9. "Kurtz's Sacrificial Worship" (Clark's Theological Library), pp. 42, 43; "Kurtz's History of the Old Covenant," vol. iii., p. 146, etc.; also, Art. "Tabernacle" in "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible."

into two compartments; the one designating the inner chamber, or personal abode of the sovereign; the other the outer chamber, or ante-room, of his family, the priests. When, however, the Israelites became settled in their own land, this moveable tent was, with equal propriety, exchanged for a still more costly and magnificent edifice of wood and stone; in which, nevertheless, the same essential parts and distinctions were scrupulously observed and kept up.

In connection with this idea of the personal residence of the Sovereign, it was ordained that there should be a table and candlestick in the holy place, or inner chamber, "because these suit the notion of a dwelling-house."¹ The table also was to have its dishes, spoons, bowls, and covers,² and to be always kept supplied with *bread*.³ The candlestick, likewise, was to have its lamps continually burning,⁴ and a fire was ordered to be kept up upon the hearth or altar of the Divine Sovereign of the people, which should never be suffered to be extinguished.⁵

¹ Nachmanides, quoted by Cudworth, "True Notion of the Lord's Supper," c. vi., p. 31, ed. 1876.

² Exodus xxxvii. 18.

³ Leviticus xxiv. 5, 6.

⁴ Leviticus xxiv. 2, 4.

⁵ Leviticus vi. 13, with ix. 24; 2 Chron. vii. 1.

This, then, was the house of the Lord, whether tent or temple, in which His presence was manifested by the Shechinah or glory,¹* which rested upon the mercy seat behind the massive veil or curtain which closed the entrance into the chamber of the Monarch.²

We have seen here that *bread* was never to be wanting on the table of the Lord. We have now to consider the nature of still more symbolical and expressive offerings in connection with this idea of the personal presence of Jehovah. And these are the *sacrifices* which were inseparable from the due worship and service of the temple.

Now these sacrifices were of three kinds :—

1. What were called *burnt-offerings*.³

¹ Exodus xxv. 22 ; xl. 34, *et seq.* ; Numbers vii. 89. See also Bp. Hinds, "The Three Temples of the One God."

* So Nachmanides, quoted again in Cudworth, c.vi., p.31: "The mystery of the tabernacle was this, that it was to be a place for the Shechinah or habitation of divinity to be fixed in ; and this, no doubt, as a special type of God's future dwelling in Christ's human nature, which was the true Shechinah."

This idea is well worked out by Bp. Hinds : "The Three Temples," etc.

² Exodus xxvi. 31—34.

³ Leviticus i.

2. What were called *sin-offerings*¹ (with a sub-division into *trespass-offerings*).
3. What were called *peace-offerings*.²

It is needless to shew that the idea of sacrifices at all is based upon the idea universally, as it would seem, prevalent among mankind, of the necessity of some offering almost invariably made by the death and blood of some living creature which should contain some admission of guilt, and a desire for, or a mode of, expiation on the part of the worshipper.³ All history, ancient and modern, proves this to be the fact, not only as existing in form as well as theory amongst heathen nations, but as even now maintaining a hold over the minds of many Christians who are not perhaps always able to account for their own impressions, or to state the nature of their belief in precise terms. The idea of a sacrifice of some kind, then, was familiar to the minds of all people at the time with whom we have any historical acquaintance. It was therefore nothing new to the Israelites in

¹ Leviticus iv.—vi.

² Leviticus iii.

³ See references under "Piaculum" in Facciolati's L. D., also under *Καθάριος* and its cognates, and *ἁγισμός*, in "Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon."

itself. All that was new was the great *object* of the sacrifice, as well as the ritual according to which it was to be offered.

We have seen that there were among the Israelites three different kinds of sacrifices; there were also three modifications in the circumstances connected with each.

1. The BURNT-OFFERINGS¹ consisted of any animal that was fit for sacrifice; but in the case of oxen, sheep, and goats, it was required to be a *male*, as representing the perfection of the species. According to the Divine ritual, the animal was brought to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, where it was slaughtered, and the blood sprinkled upon the altar² of the Lord. The animal being then cut in pieces, and the impurer parts first cleansed, it was then burned *entirely* upon the altar with the holy fire which was never suffered to be extinguished.

2. The SIN-OFFERINGS³ consisted of different animals, according as they represented the whole congregation of the people, in which case it was a young bullock; or varying, according to the

¹ Leviticus i.

² For the full Symbolism of the Altar, see "Kurtz's Sacrificial Worship," pp. 44—46.

³ Leviticus iv.

rank and means of the individual worshipper, from a he-goat to two pigeons, or even a bloodless offering, if means were actually wanting to procure the higher kinds.¹

The ritual attached to sin (and trespass) offerings was similar to that in the case of the Holo-causts, or whole burnt-offerings, except that, in this case, the priest was required to smear the blood upon the horns, or elevated corners of the altar; and, in the highest form, to sprinkle it first seven times with his finger upon the curtain before the Lord.² This done, certain portions of the animal were burnt upon the altar, the priest being allowed to reserve other portions for himself, which were to be eaten by him and his sons in a holy place, that is in the court of the tabernacle.³

3. In the case, however, of the PEACE-OFFERINGS, no restriction was made as to the animal to be offered.⁴ The ritual here was in most respects the same as in the two former. The same portions were to be burned upon the altar as in the case of the sin or trespass offerings. But after these portions had been duly chosen, a

¹ Leviticus v. 7.

² Leviticus iv. 6, 7, 17, 34.

³ Leviticus v. 13; vi. 16.

⁴ Leviticus iii. 1, etc.

certain portion of the remainder was reserved for the priests, and the rest given to the *offerer himself*, who, with all his family, was required to eat it as a *sacrificial meal* at the tabernacle itself.¹

We perceive, then, in the three kinds of sacrifices three distinctive modes of celebration. That, in the *first*, the animal was wholly burnt to Jehovah; that, in the *second*, a portion only was burnt, and the remainder given to the priests alone; and that, in the *third*, a portion was burnt to the Lord, and a portion consumed by the priests, and a portion by the offerer and his family.

It remains only to observe that, with each of these bleeding sacrifices, it was necessary to present a certain bloodless offering of the fruits of the earth. But, as in the former case it was *not every animal* that might be used in sacrifice, but only such as were legally clean; and even of these only such as naturally experienced the care and attention of man,—so it was with the produce of the soil. Not every vegetable might be used, (nor *any fruit whatever*), but only such as were the direct products of man's own industry, and the staple support of his life, viz.,

¹ Deut. xii. 5—7, 17 *et seq.*

corn, wine, and oil.¹ But as corn itself is not used except in a prepared state for human consumption and the table of men, so it was ordered to be presented in one of three principal forms of preparation to the altar.

We have, therefore, now to consider the reasons for these distinctions, and mark how they are related to one another, and how they bear upon ourselves and upon the view here taken of the true character of the Lord's Supper.

¹ Leviticus ii.

CHAPTER III.

NATURE AND INTENT OF THE JEWISH
SACRIFICES.

IN order to understand then the full meaning and purport of the three kinds of sacrifice explained in the last chapter, it must be carefully remembered that God had revealed Himself as a Covenant-God to His people, dwelling amongst them as their Sovereign in a visible abode, and requiring from them certain acts of homage; while He, on His part, rendered to them certain voluntary but covenanted benefactions.

Now, the *burnt-offering* was the outward expression of an inward sense of general unworthiness, humility, and adoration, such as is natural to man in relation to a higher and sovereign power, arising solely out of his recognition of the immeasurable distance between admitted guiltiness and the majesty of holiness, between a rebellious people and a Sovereign that possessed the power and the right of punishment. In this, then, the worshipper offered an

unblemished animal as the representation of himself, the surrender of all his inner life and being to the service of God without reserve; and, in presenting with it the fruits of the earth, he made an offering of the results of his own life's labour, consecrating the whole to Him from whom he thus acknowledged that he derived them. And in the blood which was shed and sprinkled upon the altar, the symbol of the life within him, lay the means of expiation which was effected by the act of sprinkling, for "it is "the blood that maketh an atonement for the "soul."¹ *How* this atonement, indeed, could be made, can only be understood from steadfastly looking from our present standpoint of Christian knowledge back through the ritual of the law to the shadow in the patriarchal times. For the whole efficacy lies in the essential necessity of a *vicarious oblation*. The offerer, conscious of guilt, could not offer his own life as a ransom for sins, for that was already forfeited by his own general state of sinfulness; he must bring that which (without guilt itself) could yet be brought to die in his place, to suffer for him the penalty which he admitted to be due from him-

¹ Leviticus xvii. 11.

self. He brought therefore an animal, not wild as in the field or wood, unused to man, unfamiliar to his form or usage, but one reared by himself, tended by his own care, in the full vigour of its life ; free from blemish such animals can alone incur, and innocent of all notion or conception of moral guilt or evil.¹ And before delivering over this vicarious sacrifice to the priest, he solemnly laid his hand upon its head,² thus transferring to it the power and the commission to suffer in his stead.

When, then, the blood was shed, it was admitted as an atoning sacrifice ; the offering of one guiltless to die for him who was guilty, to the God to whom the life of the sinner was acknowledged to be justly forfeited. Hence the *whole* of the animal was here consumed, for it was all consecrated to Jehovah ; and in the purest form of which an organised being is capable, namely, in the volatilised smoke, ascended from the altar of God to heaven to bear witness of the acknowledgment and the expiation. And that the life of an innocent animal *would be so regarded* by Jehovah was first shewn

¹ See on this point " Kurtz's Sacrificial Worship," pp. 116—117.

² Leviticus iv. 3, 4, 15, 29.

in that symbolical transaction, by which the life of the substituted ram was accepted in lieu of that of Isaac which had been primarily demanded.¹

Such, then, briefly and in general, was the design and purport of the burnt-sacrifice; the entire and perfect offering of the religious life of man with all its powers and fruits of action to the service of God, accompanied with the acknowledgment of a penalty righteously deserved, yet expiated by an atonement made in the person of a creature nearly belonging to himself, and which, by the nature of its own constitution, could have done no sin itself.²

But above and apart from that sense of general personal unworthiness which is the feeling of the spiritual man when brought into contemplation of his own moral nature, there is the sense of actual sin committed in moments of thoughtlessness, of ignorance, or of strong temptation. For these, when known, admitted, and felt, man desires some means of expressing his

¹ Genesis xxii. 8, 13.

² For the spiritual meaning underlying the symbolising form, see Psalm l. 7—15.

repentance, of confessing and of making atonement for his sin.

Hence in the sacrifice of the sin-offering, the prominent notion of all is that of expiation made by blood. Up to the slaughtering of the animal, we find here no difference in the prescribed ritual of the *sin* from that of the *burnt-offering*. But when we come to the *sprinkling of the blood*, we are met by this characteristic distinction that, whereas in the former the *burning* of the entire animal was the main point to be regarded and effected, here the efficacy and value centred in the shedding of the *blood* as the one and only means of expiation.¹ Hence, not only was it to be sprinkled over the altar, but it was to be solemnly smeared over the horns or most elevated portions of the altar, as rising even more appealingly to God; while, in certain instances, the most solemn invocation of His merciful acceptance was made by sprinkling it seven times towards and against the *Parocheth*, or the veil which covered the entrance of the most holy place of God. This, then, (the solemn means of expiation) being the culminating point, the essential characteristic in this sacrifice, a new

¹ Hebrews ix. 22; 1 John i. 7.

feature is introduced in the *priestly meal*, which consisted of certain portions of the slaughtered animal to be eaten by the priests alone as the family of God, in the holy place of the tabernacle.

CHAPTER IV.

PEACE-OFFERINGS UNDER THE MOSAIC COVENANT.

WE come now to the consideration of the PEACE-OFFERINGS, the third in the order in which I have undertaken to discuss the question.

There is here no distinction or reservation as to the nature of the Offering to be made ; but it was necessary that the same ritual should be adopted in regard of bringing the animal to the altar ; of the imposition of hands, and of the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar. The great feature then of *this* sacrifice, was the meal which accompanied, or rather followed it. For after the fat parts had been as usual burnt upon the altar, and the prescribed portion set apart for the priest, the sacrificer and his family were permitted to eat the remainder at the tabernacle as a sacrificial meal,¹ in festivity and thanksgiving, as at peace with their Sovereign and God.

Taking, therefore, the three kinds of offerings

¹ See "Fairbairn's Typology of Scripture," vol. ii., book 3, pp. 361-3.

in their order, the characteristic features of each are—

1. Of the first, the *BURNING of the entire animal.*

2. Of the second, the *solemn SPRINKLING of the blood.*

3. Of the third, the *SACRIFICIAL MEAL of the worshipper.*

Now, bearing these distinctive features in mind, we shall find it not difficult to severally explain and account for them; referring the entire consideration up to the starting point of the Israelitish conception of Jehovah in His relation to themselves as a Covenant-God, dwelling amongst them as a theocratic Sovereign.

For as bread was required to be always upon the table, the lamps to be lit, and the holy fire kept constantly burning, so in the various sacrifices was *food* offered to the Sovereign Deity of the nation. For as the revealed relation of God would have been incomplete without this observance; so neither would He have been a Covenant-God, had He not eaten and drunk, as it were, and in a manner, with His people. And it was, doubtless, in order to guard against the notion of

a material being in Himself, arising out of this conception, that He required the food to be *burnt*, as well as to impress upon the minds of the people the conviction that, although present among them by the visible manifestation of His glory in His house, yet "the Lord's throne is in *heaven*,"¹ towards which the sacrifice in its purest and most refined form ascended. And further, in order (as it should seem) at once to keep up this revealed conception, and authoritatively to forbid the perversion to which it might in the carnally-minded be exposed, He, by the mouth of His prophetic servant David, declares that, "If he were hungry he would not tell "them, for the world is his, and the fulness "thereof;" that they are not to think that He would "eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood "of goats."² Still, although the Israelites never did fall so low as to ascribe the notion of material being to Jehovah, or to impute to Him the *need* of bodily food, still they did recognise, and they were justified in recognising, in their sacrificial offerings, some analogy between the consumption of the animal on the altar of Jehovah, and the eating of food by man at his own table. For

¹ Psalm xi. 4.

² Psalm l. 12, 13.

“as in man corporeal meat is a means to unite
 “and continue the soul, (which is a spirit) to
 “the body: so in the land of Israel the blood of
 “beasts offered up in sacrifice had an attractive
 “power to draw down divinity, and unite it to
 “the Jews.”¹

Now, although the Israelites were, *as regarded all the world besides*, a priestly nation,—yet, *in relation to Jehovah*, they themselves could not offer sacrifice to Him except through certain of their own body duly appointed and sanctified by Him. The family of Aaron, therefore, and his descendants, were adopted by the Almighty as His family; and it was ordained by Him that, *as such*, they should “live of the temple,” and be “partakers of the altar”;² that is, when an offering was made to Him for the Divine repast, He gave to His family a portion of His own *meal* for their use and support. This was in the case of those offerings which, as in the sin and trespass and peace-offerings, were made by the worshipper on grounds of his own. But as all

¹ Reply of Cozar to King Haber, Book of Cozri, quoted by Cudworth, c. vi., p. 32.

² 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.

men are naturally guilty before God, whether His own special human family—the priests, or the nation at large ; so, when they offered the burnt-offering, they were equally with all others excluded from participation in that repast.

CHAPTER V.

ANCIENT MODE OF COVENANT WITH SACRIFICE.

I COME now to the most important consideration of all in reference to this subject. And that is, What was the symbolical meaning contained in the question of food and drink over and above the relation in which it stands to a personal manifestation of the Deity amongst men? And it will be found to be this,—that it is the true outward form and vehicle of the covenant into which God entered with His people, and which was thus continually memorialised before their eyes.

For the recognised mode of making a covenant, whether between nations and individuals, in those days, not merely as amongst the Israelites, but amongst heathen nations in general, was by a sacrifice and a feast. The *sacrifice* was first offered to the god or gods of the nation, and then the covenanting parties ratified their mutual consent and goodwill in a *feast*, eaten in common, off the remainder of the

slain victim. This being the known and established practice of the times, we can readily understand, in accordance with the principles I have previously laid down,¹ how it was accepted by the Almighty as an existing institution requiring but His Divine ordinance to adapt it to the theocratic system which He designed for Israel.

This accepted notion, therefore, of a solemn covenant governs the general theory of all Jewish sacrifices. But it is only the third kind, or the Peace Offerings, in which we find it fully developed. In the *burnt-offering*, the confession of unworthiness precluded the possibility of a joint participation. In the *sin-offering*, the worshipper being only *partially* reconciled to God, is permitted to eat only by his representative the priest. In the third, the *Peace Offering*, as now accepted and reconciled to God, he is admitted to the full participation in the sacrificial meal partaken of in common by the Sovereign, His family, and His reconciled subjects, in token of restored friendship, and the entering anew into a solemn covenant and federal rite of union. And this was what the Israelite

¹ Page 12.

knew and felt when he offered his peace-offering, and sat down with his family in festivity and gladness to eat of the sacrificial meal. And let it be carefully borne in mind that the *sacrifice* and the *sacrificial meal* were not the same. The sacrifice was first offered upon the *altar*, and then after that was completed, the meal was eaten at the *table*.¹

In order to place this subject in a clear light, it is necessary to consider those passages of Scripture in which the mode of forming a covenant is clearly alluded to. The following among others, will place the matter beyond all question²:—

“Take heed to thyself. . . . lest thou make
“a covenant with the inhabitants of the land
“...and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one
“call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice.”³

“And every oblation of thy meat-offering
“shalt thou season with salt; neither shalt thou
“suffer the *salt of the covenant* of thy God to be

¹ See Cudworth, c. i., pp. 2—9.

² In still earlier times the two great covenants were those made by Jehovah with Noah (Gen. viii. 20,—ix. 17) and with Abraham (Gen. xv. 8—17). The latter is worthy of the deepest consideration.

³ Exodus xxxiv. 12—15.

"lacking from thy meat-offering: with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt."¹*

"And they (the Moabites) called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods; and Israel joined himself unto Baal-Peor."²

In the narrative of the Gibeonites, whom the Israelites unwarily admitted to favour on their entrance into the promised land, it is said that "the men (the Israelites) took of their victuals" (*i.e.*, what the Gibeonites had brought with them, and asked not [counsel] at the mouth of "the Lord"): in other words, they imprudently made a solemn covenant with them to spare their lives; for so we read in the next verse, that "Joshua made peace with them, and made a league with them, to let them live; and the princes of the congregation sware unto them."³

Later in time, the prophet Jeremiah complains that his nation has "given the hand to the Egyptians, and to the Assyrians, to be

* Salt was the symbol of purity and sincerity. Amongst Eastern nations bread and salt are the pledge of inviolable hospitality.

¹ Leviticus ii. 13.

² Numbers xxv. 2, 3.

³ Joshua ix. 14, 15, etc.

"satisfied with bread"; i.e., to enter into treaty and alliance with them.¹

In Psalm l., David, speaking by the word of the Lord, says, "Gather my saints unto me; those that have made a covenant with me with sacrifice."² And when speaking sadly of the treachery of Ahitophel, under which he was suffering at the time, he says, "Yea, mine own familiar friend. . . which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me."³ And similarly, Obadiah, prophesying of the betrayal and death of Christ, says, "They that eat thy bread have laid a wound under thee."⁴*

These passages, then, are sufficient to prove that a sacrifice followed by a sacrificial meal partaken of by the contracting parties in common off the reserved portions of the victim, was the ordinary mode, at least amongst Eastern nations, of solemnizing a treaty, or agreement, or covenant of any kind. And more than this, they shew that such was the sanctity ascribed merely to the fact of having eaten off the same things,

¹ Lament. v. 6.

² Psalm l. 5.

³ Psalm xli. 9.

⁴ Obadiah v. 7.

* For other similar passages see Exodus xviii. 12; xxxii. 6; of also Ezekiel xxiii. 41, where *bed* means the banqueting couch; and 1 Cor. x. 7.

that an injury inflicted by one person upon another with whom he had shared a meal, was universally regarded as an act of the basest treachery.^{1*}

But to crown all, and to place the matter beyond dispute, we have but to refer to the circumstances under which the covenant was made by Jehovah with the Israelites after the delivery of the moral law, and the promise of temporal blessings as conditional upon the obedience of the people. When Moses had told them all that God had spoken to him, "all the people answered "with one voice, and said, 'All the words which "the Lord hath said will we do.' And Moses "wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up "early in the morning, and builded an altar "under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to "the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent

¹ See, as above, Psalm xli. 9, and the other subsequent passages.

* Possibly *Jael* may have excused herself from the horrible baseness of her action by the plea that she had not herself actually shared the meal with Sisera, or that she had not given him salt with the dish she offered him; still, even to offer shelter with food and drink, was a sufficient guarantee even to an enemy against injury.

“ young men of the children of Israel, which
 “ offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace
 “ offerings of oxen unto the Lord. And Moses
 “ took half of the blood and put [it] in
 “ basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled
 “ on the altar. And he took the book of the
 “ Covenant, and read in the audience of the
 “ people: and they said, ‘ All that the Lord
 “ ‘ hath said will we do, and be obedient.’ And
 “ Moses took the blood ” (which was in the
 basons) “ and sprinkled it on the people, and
 “ said, ‘ Behold the blood of the covenant,
 “ ‘ which the Lord hath made with you con-
 “ ‘ cerning all these words.’ ”¹

Now that the idea of a sacrificial meal was common to ancient nations generally, not merely to the Israelites or the people of the East, will be evident from the following passages from Homer and others of the classical writers of heathen nations :—

“ Their prayers concluded and the salt cake strewed
 “ Upon the victims’ heads, they drew them back,
 “ And slew and flayed; then cutting from the thighs
 “ The choicest pieces, and in double layers
 “ O’erspreading them with fat, above them placed
 “ The due meat offerings. * * *

¹ Exodus xxiv. 3—8; Hebrews ix. 20.

" Their labours ended, and the feast prepared,
 " They shared the social meal, nor lacked there aught."¹

(*Homer's Iliad*, Bk. I., verses 540-53. Earl of Derby's Translation.)

And precisely the same words occur in the description of the sacrifice, and general meal partaken of by the chieftains before the battle with the Trojans. (Book II., verses 484-96.² Earl of Derby's Translation.)

Again, in the *Odyssey* :—

" Thus she: and, having paid the rite divine
 " Gave to Ulysses' son the rosy wine.
 " Suppliant he prayed. And now the victims dressed,
 " They draw, divide, and celebrate the feast."³

(*Pope's Translation*, Book III.; v. 76—9.)

So also Evander invites Æneas in the eighth Book of the *Æneid* :—

¹ In the Greek, I. verses 458—68. The passage refers to the solemn restoration of Chryseis to her father by Ulysses, in deprecation of the continued wrath of Apollo, the god of the injured priest. It describes a solemn agreement, the one side restoring the captured maiden, (the cause of suffering,) the other engaging to intercede with the deity on their behalf.

² In the Greek, II. verses 421—31.

³ In the Greek, III. verses 62—6.

" Now celebrate with us this solemn day,
 " Whose holy rites admit no long delay.

* * *

" The loaves were served in canisters; the wine
 " In bowls; the priests renewed the rites divine:
 " Broiled entrails are their food, and beef's continued
 chine."¹

Dryden's Virgil, Æn. VIII., 231-2, 241-3.

It is needless to multiply instances; many more will readily occur to the classical reader² in which the same idea is expressed, and the same custom alluded to in clear and explicit terms.

Having, then, thus cleared the way, we may now proceed to consider the great festival of all, viz.: the PASSOVER, to which it cannot be denied that our Sacrament of the Lord's Supper does, in some way or other, bear relation. And that relation will be found to lie in the fact that the Passover itself was a *sacrificial meal eaten after a sacrifice to God*, wherein

¹ In the Latin, VIII. verses 169—83.

² See particularly "Plato de legibus," ii. D. (ed. Stallbaum); "Plautus, Pænulus," Act I., scene iii.; "Herod: Clio." 31; "Plutarch Symp." bk. 7, on Worship of Hecate; "Aristoph. Plutus," v. 640—676. Ed. Dindorf; (and see the Scholiast thereon.) Also below, p. 62, Note 1.

a memorial was kept up of a covenant once solemnly entered into by Israel with God, which covenant in its fulness and truth the true Israel are required equally to celebrate as a commemorative federal rite between God and man.

CHAPTER VI.

THE JEWISH PASSOVER A SACRIFICIAL MEAL.

WHEN the Passover was first instituted in Egypt, every householder was required to kill his own lamb, and to smear the blood upon the sideposts and lintel of the door. Hence some persons have been induced to call in question the true sacrificial nature of the feast. It must be remembered, however, that in Egypt each head of a family was, as in the Patriarchal times, *quoad* his family, to all intents and purposes *a priest*, for there was no altar, no sanctuary as yet established. But as soon as the law was given from Mount Sinai, the people were immediately warned that they were not to "*sacrifice*¹ the Passover within any of (their) gates, which the Lord (their) God giveth (them), but at the place which the Lord (their) God (should) choose to place His

¹ Kurtz's "Sacrificial Worship," p. 361, on the meaning of the verb *shachal*.

"Name in, there (they should *sacrifice* the "Passover at even)."¹

Had the Paschal Lamb indeed not been a sacrifice² in the truest sense of the term, the reasoning of Paul falls to the ground, when he alludes to "Christ our Passover" being "*sacrificed* for us." But even if we could entertain any doubt as to what the Apostle meant when he speaks of "sacrifice," that doubt ought at once to be removed, when we consider his inferential exhortation, "*Therefore let us keep the feast.*"³ For it must be manifest to any one who will bear in mind the nature of this argument, that he is here alluding to that sacrificial meal which was eaten after a sacrifice by the offerer and his family.

Assuming, then, that the Lamb of the Passover was a true and perfect Sacrifice, it remains but very briefly to sketch the ceremonial of the Paschal meal.

On the 10th day of the Jewish month Nisan

¹ Deut. xvi. 5, 6; xii. 5—14. See Kurtz's "Sacrificial Worship," pp. 360, etc.

² Cudworth, c. ii., pp. 9, etc. For particulars see Numbers ix. 7, 18; 2 Chron. xxx. 16, 17; xxxv. 11, 12. "Smith's Dict. of the Bible," Art. Passover.

³ 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

(or Abib), a lamb was selected from the fold free from blemish, a male of the first year, and kept apart from the rest of the flock until the 14th,¹ * when it was to be killed "between the two evenings," that is, between three and six o'clock in the afternoon (according to the Pharisees and Talmudists) but between six and half-past seven, according to the Caraites and Samaritan reckoning.² The animal being killed

¹ Exodus xii. 8—6.

* The four days during which the Lamb was kept, are explained by Kurtz to be a symbol of the consecration to the kingdom of God. [Compare the four equally-sided chamber of the most holy place—a "perfect cube."] "Four is the sign of the kingdom of God. And this "was to be the characteristic number of the Paschal "Lamb, on account of its connection with the history of "the development of the kingdom of God." "Kurtz's Sacrificial Worship," p. 366. See also the same writer, "Hist. of the Old Covenant," vol. ii., p. 300. Also "Smith's Dict. of the Bible," Art. "Number"; and more especially "Wilkinson's Ancient Egypt," vol. iv., pp. 194—199.

² The practice of our Lord on the occasion of His last Passover seems sufficient to decide this question. As He certainly celebrated it at the earliest legal hour, viz. at immediately after 6 P.M. on the Thursday, the lamb must have been killed between three and six in that afternoon. I assume that our Lord, according to His invariable custom in all things appertaining to the law,

in the forecourt of the temple, the priests sprinkled the blood over the altar,¹ and the offerer retired with the lamb to his own home to roast it and eat it with his company. Not a bone of it was suffered to be *broken*;² that is, it was not allowed to dissect the limbs, as in other sacrifices or for other meals; for the lamb was to be eaten *entire*, as the symbol of unity and of fellowship or communion, the internal fat³ only being, in this case, burnt upon the altar to God.

The repast having been duly prepared, the master of the house, or (as in the case of our Saviour) the head of the family or party took the post of honour in the centre of the middle of

did (as of necessity He must have done) celebrate the true Passover on the one only proper day. I am convinced that the words of St. John (xviii. 28) refer solely to the members of the Sanhedrim, who, in their eagerness to destroy Jesus, had neglected the true period, considering the urgency of the case a sufficient justification of the irregularity.

¹ 2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11.

² Exodus xii. 46; Numbers ix. 12; John xix. 36.

³ See the meaning of this well explained, in "Kurtz's Sacrificial Worship," p. 222, sec. 110. See also his "History of the Old Covenant," vol. ii., p. 306.

the three couches placed round three sides of the table. The first cup of wine mixed with water¹ was then filled, and grace said by the master or head of the family. The bitter herbs with a condimental sauce, and the unleavened bread having been then handed round, and a sop (made of the herbs with the sauce) eaten by each, the lamb roasted entire was placed upon the table. Then came the second cup of wine, after which the formula recited in Exodus xii. 26, etc. were gone through, (or a pause was made for the catechism, if necessary) and the first part of the Hallel,² or hymn of praise was sung. The true Paschal supper having been thus introduced, the celebrant then took one of the cakes of unleavened bread, and *broke* it, placing the pieces, after thanksgiving, upon the unbroken cake. A portion of the bread was

¹ Not for any symbolical purpose or meaning, however, but as the *best* way of drinking the wine of the country. Cf. in Latin, *vinum* as opposed to *merum*; and, in Greek, *οἶνος* as against *ἀκρατος*. See "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," art. "Wine," vol. iii., p. 1777, *a*. "Kitto's Cyclo. of Biblical Knowledge," art. "Wine," vol. ii., p. 953, *b*.

² Psalms cxiii., cxiv.

* The word Hallel is an abbreviation of Hallelujah, with which each verse ended.

then dipped with bitter herbs in the sauce, and eaten by each member of the party. The lamb itself was then carved and eaten, any portion of it which might remain over being burned with fire, that it might not become secularised, or spread over two or more meals and so interrupt the unity of the feast. Two more cups of wine were then successively introduced, and the repast concluded with the chaunting of the second part of the Hallel.¹

Now, if we apply this description to that given in the Gospels of the last Passover of our Lord, we find that in His true character as Head of His chosen family the Twelve, and Master of the feast, He broke² the bread according to custom, and gave it to each of His disciples, as He did also the wine of the *third* cup, which was known as the "Cup of Blessing,"³ after which they all went forth to the Mount of Olives, singing (or rather *chaunting*) the second portion of the Hallel as they went.

¹ Psalms cxv., cxviii.

² The breaking of the bread in the Eucharist has reference, manifestly, to the joint participation by each communicant in the one offering. See below, Bishop Andrewes, in p. 108. Also Dr. Philpot, in Fox, vol. vii., p. 638.

³ See 1 Cor. x. 16.

It is clear, therefore, upon a review of the foregoing, that the Passover was a Sacrificial Meal eaten after a sacrifice of the things offered, brought from the altar of the Lord, and placed upon a table, called the *Lord's table*, because the meat which was placed upon it was meat originally offered to God, and given back by Him to the worshipper for his own and his family's consumption.

If, then, the Lord's Supper is in any sense the successor of the Passover, it is itself likewise a *sacrificial meal*, and not a *sacrifice*; the table, at which it is eaten, is not an altar,¹ but a *table*, whereon are placed those aliments which represent that which was sacrificed by the priest for us, and are now given to us to eat *jointly*, as in the Paschal meal, in fellowship with one another, and in communion with God.*

¹ See, however, below, pp. 105—109.

* This fellowship or communion is expressed in the original by the term *κοινωνία*, signifying a *joint participation* as by guests. In fact, as Cudworth expresses it, we are "*convivæ Dei*," or joint banqueters with God. See below, p. 114.

CHAPTER VII.

FIGURATIVE MEANING IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

IF, then, the argument in the last chapter be sound, the Lord's Supper must correspond in its essence to the Paschal supper; if, that is, it be in any way a successor thereof, or founded upon it either in character or in spirit.

To consider then the words of our Lord, when He gave to the Eucharistic bread, or loaf, (ὁ ἄρτος) and wine, their potency to stand as representatives of His body and blood. He does not speak of "this bread," or of "this wine," but in each case of "*this thing*."* Neither in the language in which our Lord

* Observe, too, that our Lord throughout speaks of His σῶμα, not σὰρξ. See Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, where the unanimity of the four writers is all the more remarkable when we compare the expression with σὰρξ in John vi. 51—58, where our Lord was *not* speaking of the *Communion* of His *Body*.

spoke would the copulative verb have had any place; though that, after all, is but matter of small moment. For, upon all true principles of hermeneutics, what we have to consider in the use of words is the sense in which they would be understood by the persons to whom they were originally addressed; and such is, without doubt, the sense in which they were delivered and meant to be understood. And there can be but little question as to the way in which Jews, or any Orientals, would have understood such expressions as "I [am] the true Vine"—"I [am] the "good Shepherd"—"I [am] the Door," etc., where precisely the same style of language is employed. For the natural use of Oriental language is *tropical* or figurative, *not literal*. The former use is, in fact, the rule,—the latter, the exception. And it was only an excrescence of later growth, an offshoot of the Rabbinical school, which sought to upset the common practice, and engraft a literal meaning upon words, which ordinary hearers (and such were, for the most part, Christ's disciples) would have naturally understood in a figurative sense.¹ Now that this is a true statement of the facts

¹ See "Fairbairn's Herm. Manual," sec. viii., pp. 144—146. See also below, pp. 74—75.

of the case may be seen (1) from the frequent use of such figurative language in Scripture; (2) from the way in which our Lord dealt with misapprehensions on the part of His disciples; (3) from the way in which the Apostles speak in reference to these very subjects.

For (1) consider the following passages taken indiscriminately from various books of Scripture:

"They that eat me (sc. Wisdom) shall yet be hungry, and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty."¹ "Thou hast brought a vine (sc.

Israel) out of Egypt; thou hast cast out the heathen, and planted it."² "Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant,"³ etc. "I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed,"⁴ etc. "I have meat to eat that ye know not of."⁵ Many other like passages might be brought forward were it necessary to prove this point; but one more only need be cited as bearing very pertinently upon the case, and also as

¹ Ecclus. xxiv. 21. See also Proverbs i. 20; also viii. and ix.; Ecclus. xv. 3.

² Psalm lxxx. 8.

⁴ Jeremiah ii. 21.

³ Isaiah v. 1—7.

⁵ John iv. 32.

tending to shew how strongly the feelings of the Jews (or Israelites) must have been against such literal acceptation as some persons would contend for. When the three mighty men broke through the host of the Philistines, and brought the water of Bethlehem to the fainting David, "he would not drink thereof, but *poured it out unto the Lord*.¹ And he said, Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should do this: [is not this] the *blood* of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?"² These passages must surely be sufficient to shew the common use of metaphor in the language of the Holy Scripture, as in all other works of Oriental origin, into which the poetical element so constantly and largely enters.

(2.) But, secondly, have we any evidence to shew that the disciples must have understood our Lord (in such cases) to be speaking only in a figurative sense? We have then but to consider what was His invariable practice, when they

¹ Regarding the water as representative of the blood which might have been shed in the perilous attempt, he poured it out as an offering (Leviticus iv. 7) to God. Nothing can more strongly shew the feelings of the Jews with reference to the Mosaic command that they should not eat the blood. (Leviticus iii. 17; xvii. 10.)

² 2 Sam. xxiii. 16, 17.

failed to perceive His meaning, or when they took His words in a false sense. He carefully explained to them the real purport of His language, lifting their minds up from things earthly to the contemplation of things spiritual. There were many points, indeed, such as His death, and the true nature of His kingdom, which they did not understand, and upon which He did not enlighten their minds at the time, simply because *the events themselves* would sufficiently explain His meaning when they came to pass. But on no point of *doctrine* did He ever suffer them to continue under a misapprehension. For instance, when He bade them beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees, the disciples (who knew that they had forgotten to bring bread with them, and that they would have to buy some at the nearest village) not unnaturally conceived at the instant that there was a silent rebuke for their forgetfulness contained in their Master's words. But Jesus immediately undeceived them, reproving them for not bearing in mind the lesson of the miracle which He had just wrought in feeding the five thousand, as He had also previously fed the four thousand; on which they at once perceived the spiritual application of His words.

And, in fact, no other mode of procedure would have been compatible with the character of Jesus as a teacher of morality or religion. There were many things which were incomprehensible to His disciples at the time, but which He left to be explained, as they best could be, by the event. But he could not consistently permit an *erroneous* view of *doctrine* to remain in their minds, where positive evil must result from want of adequate explanation. The world without He indeed left to their own mistaken views and conceptions, for they had not yet received Him : and it was only to those who accepted Him upon the evidence He offered of the truth of His claims that He consented to explain "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven."¹

(3.) If we would understand the sense in which the Apostles and Evangelists understood the language of our Lord, we have but to consider their own words when alluding to the Eucharistic feast: "They (*i.e.*, the whole Church, including the three thousand souls "converted on the day of Pentecost) continued "stedfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*, and in prayers."²

¹ Matthew xiii. 11 ; Luke viii. 10.

² Acts ii. 42.

“When he, (Paul) therefore, was come up again, and had *broken bread*, and eaten. . . . “so he departed.”¹ “The *cup of blessing* which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The *bread which we break*, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one *bread* and one body: for we are all partakers of that *one bread*.”² And this question Paul puts to the Corinthian converts, appealing to them as “*wise men*,” to “*judge*” what he says. And we may be sure that, had there been any difficulty in the minds of the early Christians as to the true nature of the bread and wine taken and received in the Lord’s Supper, there would have been some explanation given in the Apostolic epistles calculated to remove all doubt upon the matter. Now there is one remarkable expression in Paul’s first letter to the Corinthian Church, where he speaks of the improper use made of the Lord’s Supper by many of these Gentile converts, who turned it too often into an occasion of mere revelling. For he says that, “he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not *discerning* the Lord’s

¹ Acts xx. 11.

² 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

"body."¹ And he goes on to trace many serious bodily illnesses, and even premature death, as the natural physical consequences (as their deliberate contempt of that holy ordinance would also argue disease, and finally death of the *soul*) of the shameful excesses prevalent on these occasions.² For they were, as we learn, in the habit of giving loose to their depraved appetites, and so failed to make the necessary distinction³ between their own secular banquets

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 29.

² It would be well, therefore, for timid persons to note that, according to our custom in the Eucharist, it is impossible to be guilty of this particular sin which drew down these punishments, not as a supernatural judgment, but as the natural consequences of the violation of law. In the case of these persons, their sin naturally brought with it its own punishment.—See "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," art. Lord's Supper, vol ii., p. 142a.

³ This is the true meaning of *discerning* in this passage, according to the etymology of the word. See Alford's, and Webster and Wilkinson's Greek Testaments, notes on 1 Cor. xi. 29.

"This (weakness and sickness) the Apostle ascribes to the judgment of God upon them (the Corinthians) for their unworthy and profane eating and drinking Christ's mystical body and blood, as if it had been common food: 'For this cause (saith he) many are weak and 'sickly among you,' etc.; and this must be the judg-

and the symbolical and commemorative ordinance of the Lord. Here, then, if anywhere, we might expect to find the Apostle alluding to this vexed question, had it existed at the time. But, on the contrary, his whole argument is based upon the fact that the bread and wine were still *bread and wine* unaltered in this, as in any other repast.¹

“ment he here means. But this is so far from eternal
 “damnation, that it is usually inflicted on purpose to
 “prevent that; and that it was so at this time appears
 “from what follows: ‘For (saith he) if we would judge
 “‘ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are
 “‘judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should
 “‘not be condemned with the world’ (1 Cor. xi. 31-32).
 —Bishop Beveridge, vol. viii., p. 573. (Parker, 1846.)

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 26—28.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LORD'S SUPPER A COVENANT WITH GOD.

THE view contained in the foregoing chapter may be further illustrated and confirmed by the language of St. Paul in his first letter to the Church of Corinth.¹ He is rebuking the Corinthian converts for having knowingly eaten of things, a portion of which had been previously offered to some idol. Now he admits that an idol is, *in itself*, nothing whatever, but a block of wood or stone, having no further existence (as a semblance of aught living), save by the will and design of the carver. Still he says the *intent* of the sacrifices offered by a worshipper to the idol is precisely the same as if there really were a representative life in the image; and that, therefore, the sacrifices offered to idols are *ipso facto* offered to devils.² "And I

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16—21.

² See "Kurtz's History of the Old Covenant," vol. ii., p. 252. "Whately's Sermons," No. x., p. 263. Ed. 1835.

* Rather "*to demons*." The word in the original is *δαιμόνια*. There is but one *Devil*, ὁ Διάβολος, i.e.

"would not," he adds, "that ye should have fellowship (or communion, Greek *κοινωνία*), that is, (enter into a solemn covenant) with devils."¹ And this is what, as he continues, they *would be doing*, if they *knowingly* eat at their own tables of things which had been offered in sacrifices to idols.* In short, they could "not serve two masters:" they could not enter into a *federal rite* with God and with demons at the same time. "Ye cannot," he says, "drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be

Satan, the old serpent, and slanderer of man, (Matt. iv. 1; Luke iv. 2; Hebrews ii. 14, etc. The word "devils," in the cases of possession recorded in Holy Scripture, is invariably substituted erroneously for "*demons*." The ancients considered these to be the souls of wicked men transmigrated, after death, into the bodies of other men, or animals. See Mark v. 13; Luke viii. 33. See also, "Farmer's Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament," and his "Dissertation on Miracles."

¹ 1 Cor. x. 20.

* It is for this reason that the Apostle bids them eat of such things as are sold in the shops in the market, without asking questions as to whether they had been previously part of a demon-sacrifice, or not. (1 Cor. x. 25—29, with viii. 1. For, as the sin of eating lies wholly in the *knowledge and intent*, the meat itself is, to those who are ignorant of its previous use and dedication, simply as any other meat whatever.

“partakers of the Lord’s table, and of the table
“of devils.”¹*

It is impossible, I think, to over-estimate the strength and meaning of these words, as regards either their bearing upon the argument under consideration, or the terrible truth which they embody. But, in order to place the matter in

¹ 1 Cor. x. 21.

* The “table” is of course used here by St. Paul, metonymously, for that which it contains.

The following extracts are well worthy of notice :—

“The priests of devils did celebrate in their sacrifices the distribution of bread and the cup; as Justinus Martyr and Tertullian make mention.” (N.B. the passages are given in the Notes.)—Archbishop Whitgift, vol. ii., p. 39. (Parker Society’s Edition.)

“For as Paul saith ‘ye cannot eat,’ etc. (1 Cor. x. 21). . . The heathen, which offered unto idols were the fellowship of devils, not because they eat the devil’s body or drank the devil’s blood, but because they believed and put their confidence in the idol or devil as in their God; and all that were of that faith had their ceremonies, and gave hearty thanks to their God, with that feast which they kept. They came to one place, and brought their meat before the idol and offered it; and with their offering gave unto the devil godly honour. And then they sat down, and eat the offering together, giving praise and thanks unto their god, and were one body and one fellowship with the devil, which they testify by eating of that offering before that idol.”—Dr. John Frith (Richmond) vol. i., p. 464.

its strongest light, it will be necessary to call attention to one fearful feature of the heathen rites. On certain solemn occasions, when they were desirous of invoking the aid of the invisible powers, it was the custom to pass round a cup full of the *blood* of the victim,¹ of which each of the covenanters in turn partook. And we can hardly doubt, upon a full review of all the circumstances of the case, that it was with especial reference to this horrible rite that the Israelites were forbidden to *taste* of the *blood*,² which was ordered to be sprinkled upon the altar and poured upon the ground. But when Christ was about to shed His blood for us, and to ordain that we should eat and drink of the remains of His sacrifice as a *covenant meal after a peace offering* by which we are reconciled to God, He sanctified the wine to represent His blood (now that there could be, or ought to be, no mistake upon the matter) as He did the *bread* to stand in place of His body.

¹ See the description of the human sacrifice and oath in the conspiracy of Catiline, "Sallust," Cat. c. 22. Of also "Dion Cassius," xxxvii. 30, and "Florus," iv. 1.

² See here, Genesis ix. 4; Levit. xvii. 10—14; Deut. xii. 16, 23—25.

In order, then, to shew that Christ did ordain the Lord's Supper to be, and that He meant us to observe it as, a covenant of deepest solemnity with God, He expressly said to His disciples, when giving to them the cup of wine, "*This is my blood of the New Testament;*"¹ or, as St. Paul expresses the same idea (and in fact the same formula), "*This cup is the New Testament in my blood.*"² But it is here as elsewhere in our translation. We do not see in the words thus rendered into English the full force of the meaning of the original. There is no such word as *Testament* in either passage.³ The word

¹ Matthew xxvi. 28.

² 1 Cor. xi. 25.

³ The passage of Scripture which is commonly brought forward to support the notion of a Testament or Will is Hebrews ix. 15—17. But, as the estates of the Israelites were devised invariably by succession, there is no reason to suppose, and there is no evidence to prove, that they ever executed a will in our sense of the term.

The first notion they could have had of such a thing would have been from the Romans; but it is hardly likely that St. Paul would have alluded to an occasional and purely exceptional practice, even had it existed at all, in such an argument as he is there employing. The truth is that the whole argument proceeds upon the acknowledged use of the term *διαθήκη*, as the recognised technical name for a Covenant. But see "Ebrard's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews," pp. 233-35,

seems to have been adopted in our version from a mistaken notion that the Gospels contain what *we* should call the "testament" or "bequest" of our Lord; in fact that the New Law contained the substance of His *Will*. But there is really no analogy whatever between our mode of making a will or testament, and that of the Jews; so that in point of fact the comparison fails altogether. The real meaning is that "This 'is the new *covenant* or agreement,¹ the new '*federal rite* long ago foretold by the mouth of 'your own prophet,² which is made between me 'and you, and is ratified by the blood of the 'sacrifice which I am on the point of making 'for you.'"

Such, then, appears to be the true nature and character of the Lord's Supper. It is the con-

291-99, where the which argument is clearly and forcibly stated. All that is known upon the subject of Jewish Wills may be seen in "Jahn's Biblical Archæology," p. 177.

It is but right, however, to state that Professor Plumptre (Art. Lord's Supper, "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," 140, b.) considers that there may be the twofold meaning of the word in Hebrews ix. 15—17.

¹ See "Fairbairn's Herm. Manual," sec. vii., p. 306.

² Jeremiah xxxi. 31—34.

³ See Hebrews xii. 24; 1 Peter i. 2.

tinual repetition of a solemn covenant or federal rite¹ with God, in which we, on our part, bind ourselves by "a solemn obligation to His service, while He, on His part, renders to us certain covenanted blessings. The sacrifice of Christ's human body has been offered up vicariously for us upon the altar of His cross, whereon His blood was sprinkled for our sins, in order to make that true atonement for us, which could only be typically shewn (or made) by the sacrifices of the Jewish law. Spiritually

¹ "This Sacrament, which was after the Commemoration Passover, is to be conceived a confederation of all Christians, one with another, to live piously and charitably, both by commemorating the death of Christ—and by making His blood, as it was the fashion in the Eastern nations, a ceremony of this covenant, mutual betwixt God and us."—Hammond's (d. 1660) "Practical Catechism," vol. i., p. 378. (Parker, 1847.)

"Which (passages) being put together, as parallels to interpret one the other, will conclude that Christ's blood was truly shed for our benefit, particularly to seal a new covenant betwixt God and us, and that this Sacrament was the exhibiting that covenant to us."—*Idem.* p. 385.

"For the Sacrament is not only a testimony of Divine grace towards us, confirmed by an outward sign, but also a mutual testification of our service towards Him."—Quoted approvingly from Calvin in the "Bibliotheca Scriptorum," p. 184.

only, then, we feed upon that true Paschal Lamb, for He has long since ascended into heaven for us, after consecrating by His Divine touch the bread and wine of the Paschal feast to be taken by us in remembrance of Him, so often as in Christian unity¹ and fellowship we share the Eucharistic meal.

“For it is not SACRIFICIUM, but EPULUM, “*ἐκ τῆς θυσίας*: not a SACRIFICE, but a *feast upon sacrifice*; or else, in other words, not OBLATIO “SACRIFICII, but, as Tertullian excellently speaks, “PARTICIPATIO SACRIFICII; not *the offering of something up to God upon an altar*, but *the eating of something which comes from God’s altar*, and is set upon our tables. Neither was “it ever known amongst the Jews or heathens “that those tables upon which they did eat “their sacrifices should be called by the name “of *altars*. St. Paul, speaking of the feasts “upon the idol sacrifices, calls the places upon “which they were eaten *the tables of devils*, “because the Devil’s meat was eaten on them, “not the *altars* of devils; and yet he doubtless “spoke according to the true propriety of

¹ John xvii. 11, 21—23.

“speech; and in those technical words that were then in use amongst them.

“And, therefore, keeping the same analogy, he must needs call the *Communion Table* by “the name of the *Lord’s Table*, *i.e.* the table “upon which *God’s meat* is eaten; not His “altar, upon which it is offered. It is true an “*altar* is nothing but a *table*; but it is a *table* “upon which *God Himself eats*, consuming His “sacrifices by His *holy fire*: but when the same “meat is given from God unto us to eat of,— “the relation being changed, the place whereon “we eat is nothing but a *TABLE*.”¹

The sum, then, of the whole course of argument is that the Lord’s Supper is *not a sacrifice*, but a *sacrificial feast after a sacrifice*. The Lamb of the Passover has been sacrificed for us once for all: and it is now our duty, as St. Paul says, “to keep the feast.” The blood has been shed, the atonement has been made, and God Himself, in the person of Jesus Christ, has given us the materials of the repast, now that we are reconciled to God through Him. If, then, this view be the true one, the bread and wine are *not transmuted* into the body and blood of Christ;

¹ “Cudworth’s True Notion,” pp. 27, 28.

and the minister who consecrates them, in so doing, does not offer a sacrifice, but gives to them solemnly the power to become the emblems or signs,¹ through which we receive Christ's body and blood truly in the heart by faith. Hence must the entire notion of a sacrificing priesthood fall to the ground, so far as relates to the offering placed upon the table of the Lord. Spiritually, each guest becomes his own priest, and presents his own offering, when he presents "himself, his soul and body, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto God."²

¹ "So likewise in the New Testament, the bread and wine be not Christ's very body and blood, but they be figures, which by Christ's institution be unto the godly receivers thereof sacraments, tokens, significations, and representations of His very flesh and blood."—Archbishop Cranmer (*in* Richmond) vol. iii., p. 450.

"And those Sacraments, together with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic fathers, do we call figures, signs, marks, or badges (*signa, symbola*), prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories."—Bishop Jewel; and see 16th Century Divines, *passim*.

"They are seals and confirmations of God's promise."—Bishop Jewel's "Treatise on the Sacraments," Rivington's, 1850, p. 9. (Richmond, vol. vii. p. 488.)

² Office of the Holy Communion, Thanksgiving (1). Romans xii. 1.

But even supposing that, by the ministerial consecration, the bread and wine, instead of becoming to us *mysteries* (*i.e.*, signs, or emblems), were really translated into the substance of the body of Christ, this would not advance us one single step in our idea of the true communion. For, as He Himself in one of His own most remarkable discourses, declared, "It is the *spirit* that quickeneth (*i.e.*, 'giveth life'); the *flesh* profiteth nothing."¹* If we could actually eat the literal flesh, it could in *itself* act only upon our *body*; the *spirit* could be benefited only in so far as the literal flesh would still be but a sign of that true body upon which we feed in the heart. It is difficult, therefore, to discover what is gained even by the admission of

¹ John vi. 63.

* So Hooker,—“When some others did so conceive “of eating His flesh” (*i.e.*, by oral manducation of the very substance of His flesh and blood), “our Saviour, “to abate that error in them, gave them directly to “understand how His flesh so eaten could profit them “nothing, because the words which He spake were “spirit; that is to say, they had a reference to a “mystical participation, which mystical participation “giveth life.”—Hooker’s “*Eccl. Pol.*” vol. ii., book v., 333. Oxford Edition, 1820.

the doctrine of transubstantiation.* But the doctrine itself is *irreconcilable with the facts of the case*; for, if our Lord really intended His words to bear the meaning thus assigned to them, He must have sacrificed Himself *before His death* took place upon the altar of the cross.^{1†} For the sacrament of the Eucharist

* "And what comfort, said he (Cranmer), can be herein to any Christian man, to receive Christ's unshapen body, and it to enter no farther than the stomach, and depart by and by as soon as the body be consumed? It seemed to him a more sound and comfortable doctrine that Christ hath but one body, and that hath form and fashion of a man's true body; which body spiritually entereth into the whole man, body and soul."—*Strype's Life of Cranmer*, vol. i., p. 546.

¹ See "Olshausen on the Gospels," iv. 159.

† "And in those words, wherein this powerful conversion is placed, He says only '*This is*,' not '*This is* transubstantiate'; and if, while He says, '*This is*,' He should have meant a transubstantiation, then it must needs follow that His body was transubstantiate before He spake; for *this is*, implies it already done."—*Bishop Hall's* (d. 1656) "*Old Religion*," p. 71. 12mo. London, 1686.

"When Christ, at the institution of the Supper, affirmed of the bread and wine that they were His body and blood, they (the Apostles) were not at all offended, as being instructed sufficiently before in the

was instituted by Himself while His own literal living body was before the disciples ; who, judging by their habitual conduct in such matters, certainly never understood their Master to be speaking of such a transmutation, otherwise they would have asked Him to explain His real meaning to them. But, in point of fact, they were already familiar with this mode of speech on their Master's part. For, when the people followed Him to Capernaum after the miracle of feeding the five thousand, Jesus, rebuking them for the greed which prompted them to seek Him, took occasion to contrast "the *True Bread*,"¹ which was *Himself*, with the perishable bread of man's making ; by which He shewed plainly the sense in which we are to understand His language. For the word which we render *true* in St. John's gospel commonly denotes not the *true* as opposed to the *false*, but the highest or ultimate form of

"nature of that mystery ; and besides this, they saw enough to tell them that what they eat was not the "natural body of their Lord ; this was the body which "He did or might eat with His own Body. One body "did eat, the other was eaten. Both of them were His "body, but after a diverse manner."—Bishop Jeremy Taylor's (d. 1667) "Discourse on the Lord's Supper," pp. 64, 65. Wheeldon's Edition, 1792.

¹ John vi. 32. See Dr. Philpot's words in pp. 97, 98.

truth as distinguished from that which is lower, earthly, or representative.¹ Evidently our Lord does not mean to say that the manna which came down from heaven was not *true* bread, as regards the nourishment it afforded to the body; but that it was only an outward or *physical* form of nourishment, a symbol merely of the true or *spiritual* food which was Himself.² So John the Baptist was, in regard of his own office, a light of the world; but, in relation to the Christ, he was

¹ "It stands, therefore, in antithesis, not to the *false*, 'for the Baptist was no false light, but only to the *relative*, the derived.'"—Olshausen on John i. 9, vol. iii., p. 344. Whately, "Scriptural Doctrine of the Sacraments," p. 92. (J. W. Parker, 1857.)

² "Neither is it to be doubted but that both manna and this water (*i.e.*, of the rock) had a prophetic mystery in them, declaring the very selfsame thing then, which the bread and wine do now declare unto us in the sacrament. . . . And Bede also, adding these words, saith, 'Behold, the signs are altered, and yet the faith remaineth one.' Thereby a man may perceive that the manna which came down from heaven was the same unto them that our sacrament is unto us; and that by either of them is signified, that the body of Christ came down from heaven; and yet, notwithstanding, never any of them said that manna was the very body of Messiah; as our sacramental bread is not indeed the body, of Christ, but a mystical representation of the same."—Dr. John Frith (d. 1533) on the Sacrament in Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. v., p. 8.

but an earthly and passing type of Him who is designated as "*The True Light*" of the world.

By the flesh and blood here spoken of, Jesus is plainly alluding to the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement; and pointing out that the sole means of our salvation lies in our becoming incorporated into His spiritual body by virtue of that which was about to be offered up for man as the expiation of the sins of the world. The actual body and blood of Christ were needed as *the means* of that great and mysterious sacrifice, *but only as the means*. The *fact*, not the material *substance*, is that upon which the spiritual life of man depends; and that is proved by the truth of the resurrection, wherein the human body of Jesus was transformed from its mortality into the glory of incorruption. The same principle of language pervades our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus, where He shews the Jewish doctor that the reason why His words seem difficult of understanding is because he is taking in a literal and earthly sense what He Himself is speaking of in a figurative and heavenly one. Nicodemus was thinking of an earthly and human birth, while Jesus was speaking of that which was purely heavenly and spiritual.

At the conclusion of Jesus's discourse with the Jews, to which allusion has just been made, it appears that some of His disciples murmured because of the "hardness" of the saying, and walked no more with Him. These persons were, of course, not the Apostles, nor those who believed in His true character, but only certain who had been attracted by His preaching, but had not penetrated the spiritual nature of His kingdom. The "Jews" also, by whom St. John always implies the high Pharisaic and Rabbinical party,¹ held a somewhat vehement argument amongst themselves upon the subject, some evidently taking the part of Jesus through a higher apprehension of His figurative language, the others affixing to it merely a literal interpretation, and one therefore incapable of comprehension by their minds. But our Lord explained (to those who would understand Him) the application of His words. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so

¹ The term "Jews," in St. John's gospel, written when the Christian religion was an accomplished fact, is used in a very marked manner as denoting the adherents of the Old in opposition to the teachers of the New religion. Such would especially be the doctors of the Law.

“he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.”¹
 “*He* lives because of the Father, in consequence
 “of His original union in essence with the
 “Father; *we* live because of Him in consequence
 “of His communication of Himself, who is our
 “life, to us, and His taking us into union with
 “Himself;”² for “he that eateth my flesh, and
 “drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in
 “him.”³ “Then we spiritually eat the flesh of
 “Christ, and drink his blood; then we dwell in
 “Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with
 “Christ, and Christ with us.”⁴

Such seems to be the true meaning and significance of the Saviour’s words—words, which if taken literally (and we have seen in the foregoing good reason to believe that they were *not*, except by a small section of the old Judaic party), must have excited the most virulent opposition to what would have been the advocacy of a doctrine not merely of a naturally repulsive description, but one opposed to the fundamental

¹ John vi. 57.

² “Webster and Wilkinson’s Greek Testament:” notes on John vi. 57.

³ John vi. 56.

⁴ “Office for the Holy Communion.” The Exhortation.

notions of their own special creed. And to conceive that the Jews would have refrained on such an occasion from some violent and decided manifestation of their disapproval is contrary to what we know from Scripture history of the character of that people.

It may be desirable here to notice further¹ the strong language of St. Paul in his first letter to the Corinthian church, language which becomes all the stronger and more important when we consider his own assertion that he received his account of the true nature and mode of celebration of the Holy Communion from the voice of the Lord Jesus Himself.² He says that a person "that eateth and drinketh" the Lord's Supper "unworthily, eateth and drinketh 'dam-nation' to himself, not discerning the Lord's 'body.'"³* And again he says that, "Whosoever

¹ See above p. 57, and the notes thereon.

² 1 Cor. xi. 23.

³ 1 Cor. xi. 29.

* "'Not discerning,' that is, not considering whose 'body it is, nor making any difference between that and 'their ordinary food, as the original word *διακρίνω* 'plainly imports.'"—Bishop Beveridge (d. 1707), vol. viii., p. 571.

"He eateth this bread unworthily, which regardeth not 'the purpose for the which Christ did institute it, which 'cometh not to it with spiritual hunger, to eat through

“shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the
 “Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body
 “and blood of the Lord.”¹

It is certainly unfortunate that such a translation should have been adopted in our Office of the Holy Communion as that to which I have referred. But, at the time when our translation of the Holy Scriptures was made, the word “*damnation*” certainly did not bear the meaning now commonly assigned to it, and which is certainly not justified, either by the original

“faith His very body, which the bread representeth by
 “the breaking and distributing of it ; which cometh not
 “to it with a merry heart, giving God hearty thanks for
 “their deliverance from sin ; which do not much more
 “eat in their heart the death of His body, than they do
 “the bread with their mouth.”—Dr. J. Frith (Richmond),
 vol. i., p. 471.

“He that eateth or drinketh unworthily, eateth and
 “drinketh his own damnation (*supra condemnation*), be-
 “cause he maketh no difference of the Lord’s body ; that
 “is, as it is said before, he that regardeth not the purpose
 “for which it was instituted, and putteth no difference
 “between his eating and other eating (for other eating
 “doth only serve the belly), but this eating was instituted
 “and ordained to serve the soul and inward man. And,
 “therefore, he that abuseth it to the flesh, eateth and
 “drinketh his own damnation.”—*Id.* p. 472.

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 27.

expression¹ or by the context itself.² Speaking at the time and with regard to the peculiar circumstances above mentioned, the Apostle undoubtedly does say that such unworthy participants did really eat and drink a *judgment* to themselves; but he shews *in what sense* he meant the word to be accepted. He was not thinking primarily, as his argument proves, of judgment to the *soul*. He was speaking of those natural results which, as I have before shewn,³ followed upon unworthy participation. It cannot be doubted, indeed, that such acts, like all others of disobedience or contempt of God's ordinances, bring us within the range of His spiritual judgments; but this is certainly not the meaning of the Apostle, nor are these the operations of God's providence to which he is alluding in the words so often misunderstood. And it is of the utmost consequence to observe and understand this distinction, because there can be no question that many persons are deterred by unreasonable fears upon this head from approaching the Lord's table at all.⁴

¹ κρίμα, not κατάκριμα.

² 1 Cor. xi. 21—34.

³ Page 57.

⁴ See the notice of "Goethe's Confession," in "Olshausen on the Corinthians," p. 187.

But it may be asked, what is the meaning of that strong expression that an unworthy participation shall render a man "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord"?

Upon this point it must be observed that, in the sacrificial meal of the Holy Eucharist, we are "partakers of the Lord's table" (*i.e.*, of that which is upon it;—the bread and wine which "do shew forth the Lord's death till He come"). There are, then, only two ways in which we can be partakers of His death, as implicated "therein," or "bound thereby," for that is the meaning of the Apostle's words.¹ The *one* is by becoming participators of all the benefits which His death and passion have wrought out for us; the *other* is by partaking, through unbelief or contempt of His holy ordinance, in the guilt of His death. This is to do what Judas did: and we cannot doubt the heinousness of such an

¹ "ἄρχος with a genitive, implies 'being bound or 'held by something.' Although he partakes irreverently, 'yet, since the bread and wine represent the body and 'blood of Christ, he cannot get free from the body and 'blood of Christ; he will be bound by all the consequences of receiving them irreverently.'"—Dr. Burton's Greek Testament, note on 1 Cor. xi. 27. See also Olshausen on the Epistle to the Corinthians," p. 184.

offence, could it possibly now-a-days take place. But what person would ever *wilfully* go to the Lord's Supper for the *deliberate purpose* of mocking His holy ordinance or betraying Him? The *unworthiness* (so often pleaded as an excuse for non-communion) which constitutes *guilt*, is not the unworthiness, which attaches to us all, of being sinful and naturally wicked; for that is what we cannot escape from; and, indeed, if we were *not* sinners, there would have been no necessity at all for Christ's Sacrifice on the one hand, or His Commemorative Supper on the other. It is precisely because we *are* sinners, that He sacrificed Himself upon the cross, and that He has provided this holy supper, first, as a memorial of that—His precious death; secondly, as a Covenant with Him by means of one sacrifice once offered for all; and thirdly, as the appointed channel of His grace conveyed to His Church until His coming to take His own unto Himself.

A deliberate violation by one party of a solemn agreement amongst men, absolves the other from the performance of his obligation. But where the bargain is made between two persons, the one of whom has undergone the

deepest pain and suffering to enable the other to receive its benefits, and that other person comes in mocking and contempt to go through a form of which he purposes never to abide the conditions, and which in his heart he derides and insults, what can one say in defence of such a man, or in extenuation of his guilt ?

CHAPTER IX.

DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINES OF THE SIXTEENTH
CENTURY.

THE view which I have taken in the foregoing chapters of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist has been supported by arguments and proofs which seem to me demonstrative. Still it is of the highest consequence, especially in times of controversy like the present, to ascertain what were the opinions upon the subject of those great divines of the Reformation, and the period immediately succeeding it, by whose energies and upon whose doctrines the Church of England was, in her present constitution, founded. For *their* doctrines are the true doctrines of the Church of England; and by them, and by their standard, we are bound in fairness and propriety to interpret the language of our Church as expressed in her Creeds, her Articles and Homilies, her Liturgy and her Catechism.

And, as respects the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, it is indispensable to bear in mind

that, while they *protested* against the modern¹ Roman error of Transubstantiation, they protested equally, by their teaching and belief, against the still more modern error which degrades both Sacraments into mere signs or rites, and attaches to that of the Lord's Supper no higher power or dignity than that of a mere commemorative institution. Such it is, no doubt ; but it is also something infinitely higher, and something immeasurably greater ; for if

¹ It was not adopted even in the *Roman Church* until the fourth Lateran Council under Pope Innocent in the year 1215 A.D. in the reign of King John. It had, however, been first broached in the eighth century, and strenuously advocated by Pascasius Radbert in the ninth. When this error was first introduced, it was spoken of by Raban Maurus, the pupil of our countryman, Alcuin, Archbishop of Mentz, as an error broached by some individuals "unsoundly thinking of LATE."—See "Hook's Church Dictionary," 3rd Ed., art. Transubstantiation. See also "Bishop Jewel's Treatise," p. 34. Ed. 1850.

"Gelasius, in an Epistle of the two natures of Christ (*contra Eutychen*), writeth thus: The Sacraments of "the body and blood of Christ which we receive are "godly things, whereby, and by the same, we are made "partakers of the Divine nature, and yet nevertheless "the substance or nature of the bread and wine doth "not depart or go away."—Bishop Ridley's Treatise (d. 1555.) (Richmond, Fathers of the Church), vol. iv., p. 219.

Christ is present "where two or three are met together in His name," so is He in a higher and a more distinctive sense, when we meet together to celebrate the very highest act of Christian worship, in "shewing forth the Lord's death till He come."¹

Let us hear upon this point what the great Bishop Jewel says in his treatise upon the Sacraments, "We say they" (the *mysteries*, *i.e.* the bread and wine) "have a dignity and pre-eminence which they had not before: that they are not now common bread, or common wine, but the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, a holy mystery, a *covenant* between Christ and us, a testimony unto our conscience that Christ is the Lamb of God, a perfect seal, a sufficient warrant of God's promises, whereby God bindeth Himself to us, and we stand likewise bounden unto God, so as God is our God, and we are His people."—*Bishop Jewel's* (d. 1571) *Treatise on the Sacraments*, p. 35. Ed. 1850.

It remains now only to see after what fashion, and in what way, the Church of England, by the mouth of her great doctors, holds and teaches the presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Eucharist. To suppose with the Roman Church that there is a material and corporeal presence, is really to degrade that presence, and to return to a preliminary stage in Christianity ; to retrograde, not to advance, in the development of the Divine dispensations. For, when Jesus was about to ascend into heaven, He expressly declared to His Apostles, that it was "expedient "for them that He (should) go away ; for (that) "if He went not away, the Comforter would not "come unto them, but (that) if He departed, He "would send Him unto them."¹ And who that Comforter is, He Himself declared a little before, when He spake of Him as "the Comforter,—the Holy Ghost."² But, further, to impress upon their minds the unity of the Holy Trinity, and to guard them from all possibility of error upon this point of fundamental importance, He taught them in the advent and presence of that Comforter to recognise Himself, for He said "I will not leave you comfortless, *I* will come to you."³ And the mode in which this joint presence subsists with us is explained by St. Paul to be an indwelling in our

¹ John xvi. 7. ² John xiv. 26, *literally*.

³ John xiv. 18; also, v. 28.

hearts through the medium of faith, after being "strengthened with might by His Spirit in the "inner man."¹ For it is next to impossible to disguise from ourselves the conviction that Jesus, in visibly ascending into heaven, did design to give ocular demonstration to His followers that His actual, material (though glorified) body was thenceforth removed from the earth; that, therefore, they were no more to *look* for Him here on the earth until the last day, for that so they would be "seeking the living among the dead." And so "Athanasius saith, Unto how many men "could Christ's body have sufficed that He "should be the food of all the world? There-
"fore He made mention of His ascension into "heaven, that He might withdraw them from "corporal and fleshly understandings."² So our Church, after declaring that "Christ did truly "rise again from death, and took again His "Body with flesh, bones, and all things apper-
"taining to the perfection of man's nature, "wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there "sitteth until He return to judge all men at the "last day"³ asserts that "The body of Christ

¹ Eph. iii. 16, 17.

² "Bishop Jewel's Treatise," etc., p. 40. Ed. 1850.

³ Article iv.

“is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only
 “after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and
 “the mean whereby the body of Christ is re-
 “ceived and eaten in the Supper is faith.”¹

And, in so declaring and so believing, we may see clearly how consonant is this institution of Christ to the compound nature of the human being. For, as man consists of body and spirit, so for the former are provided the Sacraments, or visible emblems of bread and wine in material substance, while for the latter are prepared the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ, immaterial and invisible, which, coinciding in the faithful with the natural operation of the bread and wine in the human body, strengthen and refresh the souls of all that truly feed on Him. And “here let us imagine that there are two men in every man, and that every man is flesh and spirit, body and soul. This man, thus doubled, must be furnished with double senses—bodily, to serve the body, and spiritual, to serve the soul.”²*

¹ Article xxviii.

² “Bishop Jewel’s Treatise,” etc., p. 98. Ed. 1850.

* So Bishop J. Taylor (d. 1667):—“For the case is briefly this:—We have two lives, a natural and a spiritual, and both must have bread for their support and maintenance, in proportion to their needs

If, then, there be any truth in the belief that there have been three stages¹ in the revelation of God to man, we are now in the third and spiritual stage; and all operations of the Triune God in the religious economy of man are affected by the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit. His operations, therefore, must be as much above, and as widely differing from, those of material and corporeal agency, as pure spirit is in degree exalted above, and differs in kind from, all matter, however pure and approaching perfection. And pure spirit is only God.

Our Church, then, holds the doctrine of the spiritual presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper in and amongst the faithful; a true, perfect, and in the purest sense a *real*, presence;² for, if a *corporeal* presence can be said to be real, infinitely more truly can reality

"and capacities; and as it would be an intolerable charity to give nothing but spiritual nutriment to an hungry body, and pour diagrams and wise propositions into an empty stomach, so it would be as useless and impertinent to feed the soul with wheat or flesh, unless that were the conveyance of a spiritual delicacy."—"Discourse on the Lord's Supper," p. 65. (Ed. Wheeldon, 1792.)

¹ "Bishop Hinds' Three Temples of the One God." See below, p. 123.

² See below, pp. 96, 102, 103.

be predicated of that which is *spiritual*. It is only necessary that we should define carefully in what sense and in what way¹ we understand and apply the term; for in walking by sight, and not by faith, and so inverting the rule of apostolic delivery,² we have declined in our use of language into that low view of things, which believes in the reality of nothing but what is capable of being seen by the bodily eye, or discerned by the bodily senses. And this presence, it must be now anxiously borne in mind, is neither *in* nor *under* the visible bread and wine, but is purely that of spirit with spirit, evidenced and conditioned to our composite nature by these visible sacraments, mysteries, or emblems,³ which serve at once to remind us of the one great sacrifice, once for all made, of Him who is now in heaven, and to act as a test of our obedience, as well as of that faith which is the sole means and condition of communion with Him, and of that charity which is the means of our intercommunion with one another.

¹ The reader is advised to refer to the article on the word *real*, as an instance of an ambiguous term, at the end of Archbishop Whately's "Logic."

² 2 Cor. v. 7.

³ See p. 68, and the note.

That this was the opinion of those great doctors of the English Church, by whose efforts the Reformation was accomplished in this country, and of those who immediately succeeded to their age, and reflected their teaching, I proceed to shew by the following extracts from their works. For convenience of arrangement, they may be divided into the following groups:—

- A. The great Tudor martyrs.
- B. The later Tudor divines and martyrs.
- C. The Tudor Stuart divines.
- D. The later Stuart divines.

I shall content myself with but one or two extracts from each writer; since a single clear and positive statement of opinion is all that is necessary for all the purposes of argument.

And first for the Tudor divines and martyrs.

A.

“ I answer, I say, that to the right celebration
 “ of the Lord’s Supper, there is no other presence
 “ of Christ required than a spiritual presence; and
 “ this presence is sufficient for a Christian man,
 “ as a presence by which we abide in Christ, and

“ Christ abideth in us, to the obtaining of eternal
 “ life, if we persevere. And this same presence
 “ may be called most fitly a real presence, that is,
 “ a presence not feigned, but a true and faithful
 “ presence, which thing I here rehearse, lest
 “ some sycophant or scorner should suppose me,
 “ with the Anabaptists, to make nothing else of
 “ the sacrament but a bare sign” — *Bishop Latimer*
 (d. 1555) in *Fox's Acts and Monuments*, vol. vi.,
 p. 501. •

“ Christ saith of the bread, ‘ This is my body,’
 “ and of the cup, He saith, ‘ This is my blood.’
 “ Wherefore we ought to believe that in the
 “ sacrament we receive truly the body and blood
 “ of Christ. For God is Almighty (as ye heard
 “ in the Creed), He is able therefore to do all
 “ things what He will. And, as St. Paul
 “ writeth, ‘ He calleth those things which be not
 “ ‘ as if they were.’ Wherefore, when Christ
 “ taketh bread, and saith, ‘ Take, eat, this is my
 “ ‘ body,’ we ought not to doubt but we eat His
 “ very body. And when He taketh the cup,
 “ and saith, ‘ Take, drink, this is my blood,’ we
 “ ought to think assuredly that we drink His
 “ very blood. And this we must believe, if we
 “ will be counted Christians.” — *Archbishop*

Cranmer (d. 1556) (Richmond), vol. iii., p. 318.
Ed. 1856.

"Now the Papists say that Christ is corporeally present in the Sacrament, and is so eaten, only when men receive the Sacrament. But we say that the presence of Christ in His holy Supper is a spiritual presence; and as He is spiritually present, so is He spiritually eaten of all faithful Christian men, not only when they receive the Sacrament, but continually so long as they be members spiritual of Christ's mystical body."—*Id.*, p. 511.

"And we be in such sort united unto Him, that His flesh is made one flesh; His Holy Spirit uniting Him and us so together, that we be flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone; and make all one mystical body, whereof He is the head, and we the members."—*Id.*, p. 623.

"He took His flesh with Him after the true and corporal substance of His body and flesh; again He left the same in mystery to the faithful in the Supper, to be received after a

“spiritual communion, and by grace.”—*Bishop Ridley’s Disp’n.* (d. 1555), *Fox’s Acts and Monuments*, vol. vi., p. 485.

“*Seton.*—Where is then the miracle, if He
“be only present through His grace and mystery
“only?

“*Ridley.*—Yes! there is a miracle, good sir!
“Christ is not idle in His Sacraments. Is not
“the miracle great, trow you, when bread and
“wine, which is wont to sustain the body,
“become food to the soul? He that under-
“standeth not that miracle, he understandeth
“not the force of that mystery.”—*Id.*, p.
485.

These clear and forcible expressions of the great martyr triad, may be well supplemented by the following extract from the invaluable Catechism of the learned Dr. Alexander Nowell, a work still regarded as one of the bulwarks of the English Church.

“*Master.*—Sith, then, Christ being in His
“body taken up into heaven, yet doth not for-
“sake His here in earth, they judge very grossly

“that measure His presence or absence by His body only.

“*Scholars.*—Yea! truly! for things that are not bodily cannot be subject to sense. Who ever saw his own soul? No man! But what is presenter, what nearer, what closer joined, than every man’s soul to himself? Spiritual things are not to be seen, but with the eye of the spirit. Therefore, whoso will see Christ in earth, let him open his eyes, not of his body, but of his soul, and of faith, and he shall see Him present whom the eye seeth not.”—*Nowell’s* (d. 1602) *Catechism* (Richmond), vol. viii., p. 71. (See also p. 219.)

B.

“But how shall we know the mind of Christ? Forsooth, as a man’s mind is but known by his word, so by Christ’s word shall we know His mind. Now His words be manifest and most plain: ‘This (saith He) is my body’; therefore, accordingly, should we esteem, take, and receive it. If He had spoken nothing, or if He had spoken doubtfully, then might we have been in some doubt. But, in that He speaketh so plainly, saying, ‘This is my body,’

“who can, may, or dare be so bold as to doubt
 “of it? He is the truth, and cannot lie; He
 “is omnipotent, and can do all things; therefore
 “it is His body.”—*Dr. John Bradford* (d. 1555)
 (Richmond), vol. vi., p. 485.

“Alas! that men consider nothing at all
 “how that the coming of Christ’s body and
 “blood to the Sacrament is a spiritual thing, and
 “therefore needs no such carnal presence as the
 “Papists imagine. Who will deny a man’s wife
 “to be with her husband one body and one
 “flesh, although he be at London and she be at
 “York?”—*Id.*, p. 491.

“The Sacrament is an holy sign of the body
 “and blood of Christ, which, whosoever receiveth
 “worthily and according to Christ’s institution,
 “receiveth the very body and blood of Christ;
 “yea, while Christ, through faith, which is the
 “mouth of the soul; so that he is incorporate,
 “and made one in Christ, flesh of His flesh, and
 “bone of His bones.”—*Dr. Thomas Becon’s*
Reliques of Rome, p. 26, Preface, 12mo. Ed.,
 1563.

There is a striking similarity between Becon’s

language, and that of Archbishop Cranmer in the last passage cited in p.92.

“True it is that the body is eaten, and the blood drunken, but not corporally. In faith and spirit it is eaten; and by that Sacrament the promise of God sealed and confirmed in us, the corporal body remaining in heaven.”—*Dr. John Hooper* (d. 1555) (Richmond), vol. v., p. 155).

“Who seeth not that the presence of Christ’s body is one to the faith and spirit of a man, which is spiritual, and another to the body of man, which is bodily? Besides these two, there is also another presence differing from them both, which is ‘sacramental.’ Now they of the Catholic part, as they call themselves (other men call them Papists), . . . speaking of the real presence of Christ, think there is no other presence of Christ real, but in the Sacrament, being deceived therein two manner of ways. First, they consider not the nature of a sacrament, which is, not to exhibit the thing indeed which it doth represent, but to represent one thing effectually by another: for that is the property of a sacrament, to bear a similitude of one

“thing by another thing; of the which two
 “things the one is represented, the other in deed
 “exhibited. Secondly, that they consider not
 “the operation of faith, which, penetrating up
 “to heaven, there apprehendeth the real body
 “of Christ no less, yea, and more effectually,
 “than if He were here bodily present to the
 eye.”—*Dr. John Fox's* (d. 1587) *Observations*
on Dispute between Cranmer and Weston, Acts,
etc., vol. vi., p. 521.

As a fitting commentary on Fox's words, I
 may quote again Cranmer.

“The Sacrament is one thing; the matter of
 “the Sacrament is another. Outwardly we
 “receive the Sacrament; inwardly we eat the
 “body of Christ. The flesh, I say, eateth the
 “Sacrament, it eateth not Christ's body.”—p.
 409.)

“My Lord of London may be soon answered,
 “that the saying of St. John is,¹ that the humanity
 “of Christ which He took upon Him for the
 “redemption of man is the bread of life, whereby
 “our bodies and souls be sustained to eternal

¹ See p. 71.

“life; of the which the sacramental bread is a
 “lively representation and an effectual cohabi-
 “tation to all such as believe on His passion.
 “And as Christ saith in the same 6th John, ‘I am
 “‘the bread that came down from heaven;’ but
 “yet He is not material neither natural bread;
 “likewise the bread is His flesh, not natural or
 “substantial, but by signification, and by grace
 “in the Sacrament.”—*Dr. John Philpot* (d.
 1555), in *Fox*, vol. vii., p. 634.

“We do also yield that in the Holy Commu-
 “nion our Lord Jesus is truly received of the
 “faithful in spirit by faith; whereby it appeareth
 “that our divines do not account the sacraments
 “as bare naked signs, but for things most effec-
 “tual, most holy, and things most effectually
 “appertaining to our comfort: they be sacred
 “mysteries of our religion, they be assured
 “pledges of heavenly grace.”—*Dr. W. Had-
 don* (d. 1572), v. *Osorius* (Richmond), vol.
 viii., p. 234.

C.

“You understand likewise, that this difference
 “there is betwixt these external elements. . . (that
 “is, betwixt water in Baptism, and common

“water,—bread and wine in the Eucharist, and “usual bread and wine) that these now be “sacraments sanctified to another use, to a “spiritual use, to the nourishing of faith, and “feeding of the soul, to be instruments of the “Holy Ghost, by the which, as by instruments, “we be fed to eternal life.”¹—*Archbishop Whitgift* (d. 1603), vol. iii., p. 382. (Parker Society’s Edition.)

“And again, too, that to a many with us it is “indeed so ‘*fractio panis*,’ it is as that and “nothing beside; whereas the ‘bread which “‘we break is the partaking of Christ’s true “‘body’ (1 Cor. x. 16), and not of a sign, “figure, or remembrance of it. For the Church “hath ever believed a true fruition of the true “body of Christ in that Sacrament.”—*Bishop Andrewes*, (d. 1626), vol. v., p. 67. (Parker, 1843.)

“Are not the bread and wine changed into “the body and blood of Christ in this Sacra- “ment? No! they are not changed in nature, “but in use. (1 Cor. x. 16.) For the words of

¹ The succeeding language is in even stronger terms.

“eating and drinking do properly belong to the
 “outward elements of bread and wine, and by a
 “borrowed speech do improperly belong to the
 “body and blood of Christ, to note unto us the
 “communion we have with our Saviour Christ;
 “of whom we are verily partakers by a living
 “faith, as of the bread and wine, by eating and
 “drinking them. And thus we say that these
 “elements are changed in use; because, being
 “separated from a common use, they are con-
 “secrated to sign and seal unto us our spiritual
 “nourishment and growth by the body and
 “blood of Christ.”—*Archbishop Usher* (d. 1656)
on the Sacraments, pp. 67—68, 12mo. Seeley,
 1837.

“These heretics, condemned by Theodoret,
 “Ignatius, and others, denied the verity of
 “Christ’s human nature, and therefore con-
 “demned the Sacrament of His body and
 “blood.”—*Dr. Richard Field* (d. 1616). Ed.
 1843, pp. 450, 451.

“So that it was not the implanting of Popish
 “Transubstantiation (as Bellarmine idly fancieth)
 “that was reprovèd in them, but the denying
 “the truth of that body and blood, which all
 “true Christians do know to be mystically com-

“municated to them in the Sacrament, to their
 “unspeakable comfort. How then can we be
 “charged with the heresy of these men, seeing
 “we neither deny the verity of Christ’s human
 “nature, nor make the Sacrament to be a
 “naked figure or similitude only, but acknow-
 “ledge that it consisteth of two things, the one
 “earthly, the other heavenly, and that the body
 “of Christ is truly present in the Sacrament and
 “communicated to us, though neither ‘caper-
 “naically’ torn with the teeth, nor possibly
 “to be swallowed, and carried down into the
 “stomach and belly.”

D.

“As the elements after the benediction or con-
 “secration are, and may be called, the Body and
 “Blood of Christ, without any addition, in that
 “real and true sense in which they are so called
 “in Scripture; so, when they are said to become
 “the body and blood of Christ, *nobis*, to us that
 “communicate as we ought; there is by this
 “addition, *fiant nobis*, an alloy in the proper
 “signification of the body and blood; and the
 “true sense so well signified and expressed, that
 “the words cannot be well understood otherwise
 “than to imply, not the corporal substance, but

"the real, and yet the spiritual use of them."—*Archbishop Laud* (d. 1644-5), vol. iii., p. 355. (Parker, 1853.)

"He (Mr. Nicholas) confounds (as too many
"else do) transubstantiation with the *real* pre-
"sence, whereas these have a wide difference.
"And Calvin grants a real and true presence;
"yea, and he grants *realiter* too; and yet no
"man a greater enemy to transubstantiation than
"he."—*Id.*, vol. iv., p. 284.

"I find not one of your arguments that comes
"home to transubstantiation, but only to a true,
"real presence; which no genuine son of the
"Church of England did ever deny; no, nor
"your adversary himself. Christ said, 'This is
"my body.' What He said, we do stedfastly
"believe."—*Archbishop Bramhall*, vol. i., p. 8.
(Parker, 1842.)¹

"They who are ordained priests ought to have
"power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body
"and Blood of Christ; that is, to make them
"present after such manner as they were pre-
"sent at the first institution."—*Id.*, vol. iii.,
p. 165.

¹ See also the same, vol. ii., p. 211.

“It is confessed by all divines that, upon the words of consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially present; and so exhibited and given to all that receive it: and all this not after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly, and invisible, and incomprehensible manner.”—*Bishop Cosin* (d. 1172), vol. v., p. 131. (Parker, 1855.)

“True it is that the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present, when the blessed bread and wine are taken by the faithful communicants; and as true is it also that they are not present, but only when the hallowed elements are so taken.”—*Id.*, p. 345.

The object I have proposed to myself of setting forth clearly the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper as maintained by the great doctors of the English Church, would still but be imperfectly achieved, did I omit to examine the question of the “Eucharistic Sacrifice,” for this doctrine is intimately bound up with that of the Eucharistic Presence itself.

Those, of course, who see in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper nothing beyond a mere com-

memorative institution, will deny the Eucharistic sacrifice altogether by consequence. But this is not the view which I have here advocated, nor is the question itself altogether so easily disposed of.

If the Eucharist can be regarded in the light of a sacrifice at all, it can be so only in one of two ways:—

1. In that it is to all intents and purposes, in the strict and exact sense of the term, a literal and proper sacrifice.

2. In that it is a sacrifice only by way of analogy, comparison, and remembrance.

1st. Now a sacrifice proper involves the necessity of a victim to be slain, an altar upon which it should be offered, and a priest by whom it should be sacrificed. It is clear, therefore, that according to the doctrine of the Church of England, the Eucharist is not, and cannot be, a sacrifice in the proper sense of the term. For in the first place, it would involve a contradiction of that belief which lies at the very foundation of the doctrine of the Atonement, that the death of Christ was ("by His one oblation of Himself once offered") a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the

whole world.¹ In the next place, it would introduce the very notion of transubstantiation, which she so utterly and entirely repudiates. The bread and wine remaining after consecration unchanged, are properly an *oblation*, not a *sacrifice*.” To become a sacrifice they must be changed into the actual and real body and blood of Jesus Christ, the Lord’s table must become the exact equivalent of the Jewish altar, and the minister of the Gospel must be indued with the sacerdotal functions of the sacrificing priest of the Mosaic law. This is just the point at issue between the Church of England and that of Rome ; and the entire argument of the preceding pages has gone to shew that the Eucharist is a *feast upon a sacrifice*, and not the sacrifice itself.

2nd. But it is unquestionable, nevertheless, that the term *altar* for the *Lord’s table*, does frequently occur (though not in our own Book of Common Prayer), and that the term “Eucharistic Sacrifice”² is one of not uncommon use, especially with certain amongst ourselves. More-

¹ Consecration Prayers. Office of the Holy Communion.

² “ Another name was the oblation, or sacrifice. These “two terms are somewhat similar in meaning, and are “both of Levitical origin. They have no foundation in

over, the passages from the old divines which I am about to bring forward prove that these terms have been, and may be, applied to this sacrament without impropriety, when once the sense in which they are properly employed has been clearly defined and understood. And this sense will best be gathered from a consideration of the language of our own divines in the following passages:—

“Another kind of sacrifice there is, which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to shew ourselves thankful unto Him; and, therefore, they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving.

“The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us: the second we ourselves offer to God by Christ.

“And by the first kind of sacrament Christ offered also us unto His Father: and by the

“the New Testament, but were very frequently employed in the early ages. The ordinance, from commemorating the oblation or sacrifice of Christ, came to be spoken of, first vaguely, and then seriously, as a “sacrifice itself.”—Dr. Eadie’s *Ecclesiastical Cyclopædia*, art. “Eucharist.”

“second, we offer ourselves and all that we have
 “unto Him and His Father. And this sacrifice
 “generally is our whole obedience unto God, in
 “keeping His laws and His commandments, of
 “which manner of sacrifice speaketh the psalmist
 “David, saying, ‘A sacrifice to God is a contrite
 “heart.”

“And St. Peter saith of all Christian people
 “that they be ‘an holy priesthood, to offer up
 “‘spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus
 “‘Christ.’”

“And St. Paul saith that, ‘always we offer
 “‘unto God a sacrifice of laud and praise by
 “‘Jesus Christ.’”³—*Archbishop Cranmer* (Rich-
 mond), vol. iii., p. 503.

“Dr. Ridley, smiling, answered, Your Lord-
 “ship is not ignorant that this word *altare* in
 “Scripture signifieth as well the altar whereupon
 “the Jews were wont to make their burnt sacri-
 “fices, as the table of the Lord’s Supper. Cyril
 “meaneth there by this word *altare* not the
 “Jewish altar, but the table of the Lord: and
 “by that saying *altars are erected in Christ’s*
 “*name, ergo, Christ is come*, he meaneth that

¹ Ps. li. 17.

² 1 Pet. ii. 5.

³ Heb. xiii. 15.

“the Communion is ministered in His remembrance. *Ergo*, Christ is come. For the strength of his argument is, because the remembrance of “a thing cannot be except the thing itself be “past; then could not all countries celebrate the “Communion in remembrance of Christ’s passion, except Christ had been come and suffered.”—*Bishop Ridley in Fox’s Acts and Monuments*, vol. vii., p. 536.

“As these are their (the Papist’s) imaginations so we want not ours. For many among us fancy only a sacrament in this action “(*fractio panis*), and look strange at the mention “of a sacrifice; whereas we not only use it as a “nourishment spiritual, as that it is too, but as “a mean also to renew a ‘covenant’ with God “by virtue of that sacrifice, as the Psalmist “speaketh.¹ So our Saviour Christ in the institution telleth us in Luke xxii. 20, and the “Apostle in the Hebrews xiii. 10.² And the

¹ Psalm l. 5.

² The passages referred to by the Archbishop are the following:—

1. “Gather my saints together unto me: those that “have made a covenant with me by sacrifice.”—*Ps.* l. v.
2. “This cup is the New Testament in my blood which “is shed for you.”—*St. Luke* xxii. 20.
3. “We have an altar, whereof they have no right to “eat which serve the tabernacle.”—*Heb.* xiii. 10.

“old writers use no less the word sacrifice than
 “sacrament—altar, than table—offer, than eat;
 “but both indifferently, to shew there is both.”
 —*Bishop Andrewes*, vol. v., pp. 66, 67. (Parker
 Society, 1843.)

“We acknowledge an Eucharistic sacrifice of
 “praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative
 “sacrifice, or a memorial of the Sacrifice of the
 “Cross; a representative sacrifice, or a repre-
 “sentation of the Passion of Christ before the
 “eyes of His heavenly Father; an impetrative
 “sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and
 “benefit of His passion, by way of real prayer;
 “and, lastly, an applicative sacrifice, or an appli-
 “cation of His merits unto our souls. Let him
 “that dare go one step further than we do, and
 “say that it is a suppletory sacrifice to supply the
 “defects of the sacrifice of the cross.”—*Bishop*
Bramhall, (Parker, 1842,) vol. ii., p. 276. See
 also, i. 54; ii., 88, 642.

“‘This our sacrifice of praise and thanks-
 “‘giving.’ That is, this sacrifice of our Eucha-
 “rist. In which regard, as in divers others
 “besides, the Eucharist may, by allusion,
 “analogy, and extrinsecal denomination, be fitly
 “called a sacrifice, and the Lord’s table an

“altar, the one relating to the other; though
 “neither of them can be strictly and properly so
 “termed. It is the custom of Scripture to de-
 “scribe the service of God, under the New Tes-
 “tament, be it either internal or external by the
 “terms that otherwise most properly belonged to
 “the Old, as immolation, offering, sacrifice, and
 “altar. . . . And indeed the sacrament of the
 “Eucharist carries the name of a sacrifice, and
 “the table whereon it is celebrated, an altar of
 “oblation, in a far higher sense than any of
 “their former services did, which were but the
 “types and figures of those services that are per-
 “formed in recognition and memory of Christ’s
 “own sacrifice once offered upon the altar of
 “His cross.”—*Bishop Cosin*, vol. v., pp. 347-8.

Again, “All other ways but this (praise
 “and thanksgiving) the Eucharist or any other
 “sacrifice we make are improperly, *et secundum*
 “*quandam similitudinem*, called sacrifices.”—
Id., vol. v., p. 115.

“The New Testament acknowledgeth no
 “proper sacrificing priests but Christ Jesus only.
 “Neither is there any word or sentence in our
 “Saviour’s doctrine concerning any real sacri-

“fice, but only of Himself upon the cross;
 “neither was any altar used and ordained by
 “Christ and His Apostles. And if, in all real sacri-
 “fices, the matter of the oblation must be really
 “destroyed and changed, and no physical de-
 “struction or change is made in the body of
 “Christ, or in the elements of bread and wine
 “by transubstantiation, then Romanists have
 “devised a real sacrifice in the New Testament
 “which hath no Divine institution.”—*Dr.*
White’s Reply to Fisher, quoted by Hakewill,
 p. 48, Ed. 1641. (An exhaustive Treatise on
 the subject).

“It is our Christian sacrifice, even a lively
 “representation of the all-sufficient sacrifice of
 “Christ upon the Cross, and the means to make
 “us partakers of the fruits and benefits thereof.
 “And therein we resign over ourselves unto the
 “service of God, and so offer up our bodies a
 “living sacrifice by killing our sinful lusts and
 “affections. . . . In the Sacrament we offer unto
 “our God our Faith, our Prayers, our Thanks-
 “giving, our Almsdeeds, with a contrite and
 “broken heart; all which are special sacrifices,
 “acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.”—
Bibl. Scriptorum, 1709, p. 184.

ON 1 PETER II. 5.

1. *Sacrifices.*

They are therefore built up that they may offer such sacrifices. 1. Themselves. 2. Good Works. 3. Prayer. 4. Praise. 5. The Eucharist.

2. *Spiritual.*

1. "Because of a spiritual nature, not corporeal.

2. "Offered in the spirit.

3. "Offered in a spiritual manner."—*Bishop Beveridge* (d. 1707), vol. ii., p. 423. (Parker, 1843.)

It is clear, therefore, from the foregoing statements, that the term "Eucharistic Sacrifice" is not to be repudiated as altogether improper to be applied to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But it is equally certain that the language of the passages refers exclusively to a purely analogical, allusive, and commemorative sacrifice, by the transference to the offering of the Lord's table under the New Testament of the terms by which the sacrifice of the typical victims of the Mosaic ritual was fitly described in the Old. In this sense, therefore, the Lord's

Supper is so styled a sacrifice simply by a metaphor.

There is, however, a sacrifice properly speaking, which the Church teaches, made in the Lord's Supper, when each communicant offers the sacrifice of "himself his soul and body to be "a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice" unto God.¹ And in this sense each individual communicant is a priest, just as, under the Old Covenant, the Israelites, though they had the Aaronic priesthood for special sacrifices, were yet "a kingdom of priests and an holy nation."² It is also a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," where the word is clearly used synonymously with *oblation*.

In the allegorical sense previously pointed out, the Eucharistic sacrifice is thus defined by the learned Joseph Mede.³

"It is an offering whereby the offerer is made "partaker of God's table, in token of covenant and "friendship with Him : more explicitly thus—an "offering unto the Divine Majesty of that which "is given for the food of man ; that the offerer "partaking thereof, might, as by way of pledge,

¹ "Post-Communion Service," Prayer.

² Ex. xix. 6.

³ Hook's "Church Dictionary," art. Sacrifice.

“be certified of his acceptance into covenant and fellowship with his God by eating and drinking at His table . . . for to have society and fellowship with God, what is it else but to be in league and covenant with Him? In a word, a sacrifice “is *oblatio fæderalis*,” (i.e., a federal or covenant offering).

And this is what has here been contended for in the entire foregoing argument.¹

Before, however, concluding this chapter, I would beg the serious attention of the reader to the following passages, which are but the reflection of opinions which meet us everywhere in the works of the old divines.

“Yet all the time we find as different expressions among those primitive fathers, as among our modern writers at this day; some calling the sacrament ‘the sign of Christ’s body and blood;’ ‘the figure of His body;’ ‘the symbol ‘of His body;’ ‘the mystery of His body;’

¹ For information respecting the original altar controversy, see “Fuller’s Church History,” vi. 110, and note thereon (Brewer’s Edn.); “Collier’s Ecclesiastical History,” vi. 247; also, the Theological Dictionaries of Hook, Robinson, and Buck, articles Altar, Sacrifice, etc.

“the exemplar; type, and representation of His
 “body;’ saying that the elements do not recede
 “from their first nature; others naming it the
 “true body and blood of Christ changed not in
 “shape, but in nature; yea, doubting not to say
 “that in this sacrament we see Christ, we touch
 “Christ, we eat Christ, that we fasten our teeth
 “in His very flesh, and make our tongues red
 “with His blood. Yet, notwithstanding, with
 “them there were no questions, no quarrels, no
 “contentions among them; there needed no
 “councils to order them, no conferences to re-
 “concile them, because they contented them-
 “selves to believe what Christ had said, ‘This is
 “‘my body,’ without presuming to determine
 “the manner how it is His body; neither weigh-
 “ing all their own words so exactly before any
 “controversy was raised, nor expounding the
 “sayings of other men contrary to the analogy
 “of faith.”—*Archbishop Bramhall*, vol. i., pp.
 10, 11.

“I cannot see where any real difference is
 “betwixt us (*i.e.*, the Churches of England and
 “of Rome) about this real presence, if we would
 “give over the study of contradiction, and
 “understand one another aright. Maldonate,

“*De Sacr.*, p. 143, after a long examination
 “of the matter, concludes, *i.e.*, agrees, thus at
 “last with us all, so the words be not taken
 “exclusive, as the Puritans will take them:
 “*Corpus Christi sumitur a nobis sacramentaliter,*
 “‘*spiritualiter, et realiter, sed non corporaliter,*’
 “and so have I heard my Lord Overall preach
 “it an hundred times.”—*Bishop Cosin*,¹ vol. v.,
 p. 155.

Again,

“As to the manner of the presence of the
 “body and blood of our Lord in the blessed
 “Sacrament, we that are Protestant and reformed
 “according to the ancient Catholic Church, do
 “not search into the manner of it with perplex-
 “ing enquiries, but after the example of the
 “primitive and purest Church of Christ, we bear
 “it to the power and wisdom of our Lord,
 “yielding a full and unfeigned assent to His
 “words.”—*Id.*, vol. iv., p. 156.

“And generally they (the old fathers) make
 “it a mystery, but descend not to the revealing
 “the manner of it, having it as a matter of

¹ Cosin was for some time chaplain to Overall, while
 Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.

"faith, but not of sense, to be believed, but not
"grossly fancied or described."—*Dr. H. Hammond* (d. 1660), vol. i., p. 385. (Parker, 1847.)

"With the same wisdom and sobriety the
"Church of England speaks of this great
"mystery; she does not (as the Church of
"Rome unjustly charges us) exclude Christ out
"of the Sacrament, and make it a bare sign, and
"figure of His body and blood; she indeed
"denies their carnal and corporal presence of
"Christ in the Sacrament, and acknowledges
"only an heavenly and spiritual presence, with-
"out any farther defining of the manner in
"particular."—*Dr. W. Bray* (d. 1730), p. 20.
Ed. 1641.

Surely these are true and weighty words, and
this is the only right and wholesome way of
looking at a subject of Divine mystery. It is in
the desire to be overwise, and in the tendency to
an obstinate positivism that the danger to Chris-
tian unity seems chiefly to lie. Parties dispute
vehemently about terms, from the lack, as it
would seem, in most cases, of taking the trouble
first to settle between themselves in what sense
they agree to understand them. In theology,

as in other sciences, there is a scientific as well as a popular use of language, and if these two uses be not kept distinct in the mind, confusion and contradiction may be expected constantly to arise. Such is the case especially with the words, "real," "true," and "substance," respecting which (the latter two especially) so many disputes have taken place, many of which might have been avoided, had the precise sense of the terms as employed been previously defined.

We have already seen¹ that the sense in which Christ spoke of Himself as the *true* bread, is not that in which this word is commonly taken. He does not so speak of Himself as *true* in opposition to the manna as *false*, nor does St. John, in speaking of Him as the "*true* light," mean that the Baptist was a *false* one. *True* is evidently here predicated of Him who was true in a sense in which it could be said of no other person or thing, as the highest and perfect existence, of which all others were but representatives and types, and therefore, though true of themselves, yet not so in comparison with that which they represented.²

¹ Page 71, etc.

² It is observable that Johnson does not give this sense of the word.

Again, with regard to the word *real*, all schoolmen know that there is a technical or scientific sense, as well as a popular one, attaching to the word. In its "first intention," it is defined to be that which relates "to *things*, not "*persons*"; in the second, that which is "not "fictitious, not imaginary; true, genuine."¹ According to the intention, then, in which it is used, it may be taken to designate, either that which is *material*, or equally that which has an actual genuine existence or subsistence; which may be predicated of things spiritual with at least equal propriety with things material.

And so for "substance." This word, adopted from the Latin, denotes "being; something existing; something of which we can say that it "is." And the passage which the lexicographer quotes in illustration of his definition, is one in which the poet Davies speaks of the *soul* as "a "*substance*, and a perfect being." It is only in the fourth sense there given, that it is interpreted as something "real, not imaginary; "something solid, not empty." And in the fifth, that it is applied to "body, corporeal "nature."²

¹ Johnson.

² *Id.*

Is there not, then, sometimes a confusion in the mind when engaged upon metaphysical subjects without due previous study, or when the temper is heated by the vehemence of controversy, which tends to set wide apart what were fundamentally, and in all necessary particulars, only lighter or deeper shades of one and the same opinion? And is there not generally too great a desire to impose one's own views upon others, or, at least, rather to seek out their points of divergence, than by judicious moderation to keep out of sight minor and debateable expressions, and bring into prominence the broad ground of agreement? It would be well to imitate in this respect the advice of Archbishop Grindal, who "freely thus expressed himself in this matter: "That there were some things in them ('Philpot's "Examinations) that needed the file; that is, "some prudent hand to usher them into the "world. For that Philpot seemed to have "somewhat ensnared himself in some words, "not so well approved, as that Christ is *really* "in the Sacrament."—*Strype's Life and Acts of Archbishop Grindal*,¹ p. 29.

In fine, the greater part of the differences

¹ Archbishop Grindal died in 1583.

which have existed upon this and kindred subjects of Divine revelation appear to have had their origin in the curiousness of man to be wise above that which is written, to define that which is incapable of definition, and to explain what, from the very nature of the case, is wholly unsusceptible of explanation.

CONCLUSION.

SPIRITUAL NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

IF, then, we are led by the course of our reasoning to consider the Lord's Supper, not as a sacrifice, but as an Eucharistic feast, do we thus detract from the deeper inner meaning, the mysterious power of that holy solemnity? Far from it: rather do we take it from off a disputable and unsteady basis, and place it upon one alike intelligible and secure. It still remains a divinely-appointed test of our faith, our obedience, our love to our crucified Lord. It still abides with us as the only certified continual channel of the extraordinary gifts of His grace to "all them "that with hearty repentance, and true faith "turn unto Him."¹ It still involves the necessity, and attests the verity, of His Presence with us as surely, and more potently, than when the visible emblem of that Presence dwelt on the mercy-seat in tabernacle or in temple, or abode

¹ Office of the Holy Communion, the Absolution.

in the person of His Incarnate Son when He lived amongst men upon the earth. To believe less than this indeed would be to ignore or disbelieve His own words,¹ To believe that He is *corporeally* present would be to *undo* the work of the day of Pentecost, and to return to a period when the kingdom of God was not yet come, but only "at hand."

For there have been *three stages*² in the revelation of God to man, apportioned, we may well believe, to the gradual development of human power and capacity to receive it.

1. For, first, God revealed Himself as JEHOVAH to a small people, who approached Him through His appointed high priest, under a covenant, wherein His glory was displayed for a time in an earthly tabernacle made with the hands of men.

2. Secondly, He manifested Himself in His Divine Son, who was at once "the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His Per-

¹ Matthew xviii. 20; xxviii. 20; John xiv. 18, 19.

² "Bishop Hinds' Three Temples of the One God."
"Archbishop Whateley's Sermons on various Subjects,"
Nos. iii., viii.

“son,”¹ in whom “dwelt all the fulness of the “Godhead bodily;”² and who “declared” Him, that is, gave the clearest representation which men could comprehend of the invisible God in His human body, in which He *dwelt as in a tabernacle*³ temporarily amongst men, who “held His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.”⁴

3. And, lastly, He dwells now with us in His third temple, the united body of all faithful Christians,⁵ in whom abides the Holy Spirit, “working in us both to will and to do,” helping our infirmities, and comforting us with His true and veritable Presence, according to the promise which He gave to His disciples before quitting the earth.⁶ And when He did quit the earth, it was visibly before the eyes of men, to give them positive assurance that He would no longer be with them bodily, but that they must henceforth seek Him by the Spirit which should illuminate the third temple of His glory upon earth.

And here let us observe how, upon all human

¹ Hebrews i. 3.

² Colossians ii. 9.

³ ἱσχυρίσασθαι ἐν ἡμῖν.

⁴ John i. 14.

⁵ 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17 ; vi. 19 ; Eph. ii. 20—22.

⁶ Matthew xxviii. 20 ; John xiv. 16—18.

principle of reasoning, this gradual development was necessitated for man. So long as the company of believers was but small, and restricted to one small tract of country, the human body of the Christ was accessible to all, who sought Him to lay their petitions before Him, and cast their infirmities upon Him. But when the Gospel became spread over the world, how could all have access equally unto Him, who, while fulfilling the conditions of His true humanity, could be only in *one place* at the same time, and whose bodily presence therefore could not have sufficed to meet the wants of all? And the kingdom of heaven was *not* then come, for the *preaching* of Jesus Himself was but a continuation of the "Elijah-work" of the Baptist.² He reserved it for the operation of the Holy Spirit to complete the work, and through His Apostles to announce that "the great and notable day of "the Lord"³ had finally come.

To connect, therefore, any notion of *corporeity* with the present manifestation of God upon

¹ "Bishop Hinds' Three Temples," etc.

² "Hengtenberg's Christology of the Old Testament," vol. 4, p. 239.

³ Acts ii. 20; Joel ii. 31, where the word *notable* is translated *terrible*; and in Malachi iv. 5, *dreadful*.

earth would be to suppose a *retrograde* movement in the Divine revelation such as we are not justified, either in reason or Scripture, in accepting. The present administration is that higher and truer one *of the Spirit* by whom alone "through Him we have access to the Father."¹ And this is the final dispensation of God,² the last development of man in this world; for it is the nearest approach which he can here make towards realising the spiritual life in heaven. For, as "flesh and blood cannot inherit the "kingdom of God,"³ and as Christ Himself has long since ascended into heaven, it is only by the eye of faith that we can here discern Him, until the day shall come when, transformed by the incomprehensible power of the resurrection, the eye of the glorified body shall enable us to see Him as He is!

In this belief, then, let us be content patiently to abide, conscious even here of a spiritual life within this mortal organism, a life which, having its germs here on earth, waits only for the final day to be developed in the full power

¹ Eph. ii. 18, etc.; Rom. v. 2; 1 John iii. 24; iv. 13.

² Hebrews i. 2; 2 Tim. iii. 1; 1 John ii. 18, etc.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 50.

of immortality. Sustained by Almighty power, nurtured by the invisible supplies of Divine grace, so we may here learn to live in the world as not of it, not taken "out of the world" before His good time, but by the power of His merciful Spirit "kept from the evil"¹ that is in it. Learning day by day thus more and more the full meaning of the "communion of saints," throwing off constantly, little by little, the overlappings of a corrupt nature, we shall find that even here there is a far-reaching power that knits our inner being to the very nature of Christ's own body. So shall old things pass gradually away, and all things become new to the eye that, fixed stedfastly by faith in Christ, looks forward to the day when we shall see Him as He is, in that glorious light of the Sun of Righteousness, which "no earth-born cloud"² shall ever again veil from our eyes.

¹ Rather, "Out of the hands of the Evil One."—*St. John* xvii. 14, 15.

² "Keble's Evening Hymn," ver. 11.

LONDON:
WILLIAM MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER ROW.

